

d 4c

Dr. SHERLOCK'S  
PRESERVATIVE  
CONSIDERED.

The First Part, and its Defence,  
Proved to contain Principles which destroy all right  
use of Reason, Fathers, Councils, undermine  
Divine Faith, and abuse Moral Honesty.

In the Second Part,  
Forty malicious Calumnies and forged Untruths laid  
open; besides several Fanatical Principles which  
destroy all Church-Discipline, and oppose Christ's  
Divine Authority.

In Two Letters  
OF  
F. LEWIS SABBAN of the  
Society of JESUS.

---

With Allowance.

---

L O N D O N,

Printed by Henry Hills, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty,  
for His Household and Chappell; And are sold at his Printing-  
house on the Ditch-side in Black-Fryers. 1688.

DR. S. H. A. LOCKE  
PRESERVATIVE

The first part of the Defence  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the second part

of the Society of Jesus  
in the third part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fourth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fifth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the sixth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the seventh part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eighth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the ninth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the tenth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eleventh part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the twelfth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the thirteenth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fourteenth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fifteenth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the sixteenth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the seventeenth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eighteenth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the nineteenth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the twentieth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the twenty-first part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the twenty-second part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the twenty-third part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the twenty-fourth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the twenty-fifth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the twenty-sixth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the twenty-seventh part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the twenty-eighth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the twenty-ninth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the thirtieth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the thirty-first part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the thirty-second part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the thirty-third part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the thirty-fourth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the thirty-fifth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the thirty-sixth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the thirty-seventh part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the thirty-eighth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the thirty-ninth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fortieth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the forty-first part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the forty-second part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the forty-third part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the forty-fourth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the forty-fifth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the forty-sixth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the forty-seventh part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the forty-eighth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the forty-ninth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fiftieth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fifty-first part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fifty-second part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fifty-third part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fifty-fourth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fifty-fifth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fifty-sixth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fifty-seventh part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fifty-eighth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the fifty-ninth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the sixtieth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the sixty-first part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the sixty-second part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the sixty-third part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the sixty-fourth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the sixty-fifth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the sixty-sixth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the sixty-seventh part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the sixty-eighth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the sixty-ninth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the seventieth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the seventy-first part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the seventy-second part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the seventy-third part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the seventy-fourth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the seventy-fifth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the seventy-sixth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the seventy-seventh part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the seventy-eighth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the seventy-ninth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eightieth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eighty-first part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eighty-second part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eighty-third part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eighty-fourth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eighty-fifth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eighty-sixth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eighty-seventh part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eighty-eighth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the eighty-ninth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the ninetieth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the ninety-first part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the ninety-second part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the ninety-third part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the ninety-fourth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the ninety-fifth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the ninety-sixth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the ninety-seventh part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the ninety-eighth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the ninety-ninth part  
of the Society of Jesus  
in the hundredth part  
of the Society of Jesus

THE CIVIL SERVICE

OF  
THE CIVIL SERVICE  
OF THE  
SOCIETY OF JESUS

OF THE  
SOCIETY OF JESUS

LONDON  
Printed by Henry W. Turner, Printer to the Society of Jesus, for the Honorable and Reverend Father General, and the Society of Jesus, in the City of London, in the Strand, at the Sign of the Three Kings, in the Year 1663.

---

TO THE  
**READER.**

**Y**OU will find in the Postscript  
an Answer to the Preface set be-  
fore the Defence; which being  
a Heap of undigested Untruths, and  
ill-contriv'd Calumnies, I conceived it  
most proper to expose them that relate to  
me in particular, after I have wiped off  
the Dirt which the Defence hath cast  
upon the Churches Doctrin. Besides, I  
thought my self bound in Justice and good  
Manners to yield the Preference to the  
Honest Footman, whose Style is not  
near so Lewd and Unmannerly as the  
outrageous Preface-maker's, who may  
with reason be supposed a Minister, that  
C A.

To the Reader.

**CANONICAL GOWN**

*having these late Years been a constant Sanctuary to so many Libelling, Slandering, Prophane, Reviling, Peevish and Uncharitable Pens, that the greatest part of those Books which in any of these kinds have appeared of late Years in this Kingdom, have been the not-unnatural Issues of these Meek, Charitable, Humble and Loyal Levites.*



S I R,

**T**H O' you have declared to some Friends, That you do not conceive your self under any Obligation of Answering my first Letter, the Licencing of a Book being (I perceive) but a Friendly Office, and a cheap one too, when Conscience only and Reputation may be concern'd in it, and not obliging the Licenser to boggle at any *Calumnies* he meets with in it, nor at any *Falshood* that imposes upon the Readers, tho' in a Concern of so high a nature as the True Faith and Eternal Salvation : However, I will tempt your good Nature and Civility once more, hoping that you may at least make use of Dr. *Sherlock's* happy Contrivance ; and when you are sensible that Five or Six Weeks Endeavors cannot suggest any Answer that may appear to Public View, without betraying the weakness of your Cause, and the unwarrantable Methods us'd in its defence, you will find out some *Honest Footman*, who will not blush to own all the Wrong, and impertinent Reasoning which must make up a seeming Answer.

I am confident, how unkindly soever you may deal with others, that you owe Dr. *Sherlock* so much Deference, as not to License a Book Printed in his Defence, without his Perusal and Allowance. Wherefore not to trouble the Footman, whose *Circumstances* (as we are told) can expect but a small allowance of time, I shall look on the Answers given by Dr. *Sherlock's* Second, as offered, or at least owned by him, and Examine how he supports those Principles by which I pretend that he overthrows, First, *All right use of Common Sense*.

It is a Catholic Principle, That he who has an Infallible Guide, need not mistrust him so, as to enquire farther, whether he be in the right Way, tho' he may and ought to improve himself in the knowledge of the Way he is directed in. Dr. *Sherlock*, in opposition to this self-evident Principle, charges the Catholic Church with this great Crime, That it will not allow the reading of Heretical Books ; adding, That God

*Preservat.  
Fol. 3.*

Gal. 1. 8.

not only allows, but requires it. This seemed to me extravagant, not to say impious, and to all those who have inherited from St. Paul that Faith to which he exacts so firm and unwavering an adherency, that if an Angel from Heaven should teach us any thing in opposition to it, we ought not to mind him, or to return him any other Answer than *Anathema*. How can, said I, this positive Certainty stand with an Obligation of reading Heretical Books which oppose that Faith, to frame by them, and settle a Judgment? By what Text doth God deliver this Injunction? I asked farther, how standing to the first Principles of *Common Sense*, a Church that declares all Men bound to *Judge for themselves*, could Countenance Laws which exact of *Dissenters*, that they stand not to that their Judgment, but Comply against it; and that constrain their liberty of Judging by the dread of Excommunications, Sequestrations, Imprisonments, Exclusion from the chiefest Properties of free-born Subjects, even by Hanging and Quartering: which is to make it Death not to act against a strict Duty of Conscience, acknowledg'd by the Persecutors to be such. These were three material Questions; I waited Six Weeks for an Answer, and he returns me at last by his Footman this wonderful one: *That I leave out what was said of the Bible. Dr. Sherlock blaming the Church of Rome, for not suffering her People to dispute their Religion, or to read Heretical Books, may not so much as to look into the Bible it self; that I take it for granted, that all the Writings of Protestant Divines are Heretical Books, nay the Bible it self too.* I wonder not the Doctor should give this his Answer by a Footman; he hath yet, I conceive, some remnants of Modesty. But is there here one word of Answer to my three Questions? No, not a syllable, nor of Truth neither. I reflected on no Divines of any Persuasion; I found *Heretical Books* in the number of those which he blames our Church for not recommending, and which he assures us God requires the reading of. This being an Objection of a new Coin, and a Proof of his own Invention, I shew'd the Unreasonableness of the one, and asked an Instance of the other, passing by that trivial Calumny so often Answered, *That the Catholic Church suffers not her People to look into the Bible it self*; which supposes that we lock up the Bible,

as the *Romans* did their *Sybillin Books*, whereas many thousands are commanded by the Catholic Church, setting aside all temporal Concerns, to make the reading of the Word of God their continual study, and to teach daily the Doctrine of it to those who not having learnt to read, or being of too weak a Judgment to carry away the Sense of a Book, or too much taken up by their Trades and Employes, by which they support their Families, and earn themselves a necessary Livelihood, have not the Leisure or Capacity to gather the Articles of Christian Belief, or the different Parts of Christian Duties from it: for to all others, who conceive they may reap a Benefit from it, leave is never deny'd to read the Bible, translated to that end into all vulgar Tongues.

In the close an Answer is attempted, and the Author of the *Defence* tells me, *He is not content with an Implicit Faith; That we are commanded to try the Spirits, and so try all things.* These are the Texts produc'd to maintain Dr. *Sherlock's* three Positions, *That we are obliged to read Heretical Books, That God commands it, That each one is to judge finally for himself.* I offer the following Observations on these Texts to your second thoughts.

With reason St. *Paul* commands each Christian to try all things, and to retain what is good: And St. *John* in plainer terms, *Not to credit every Spirit, but to try the Spirits, if they be of God*; for, as St. *John* observes in that very place, *many false Prophets have appeared in the World*: And since 'tis necessary that *Heresies arise*, there will ever be many such, the Ministers of *Satan*, as St. *Paul* minds us, 2 Cor. 11. 15. *transfiguring themselves like unto the Ministers of Justice.* We ought not then to believe each Man that pretends to the pure Word of the Lord, to the Spirit of the Lord. The Question is, How we ought to try these different Spirits? Each Man, says Dr. *Sherlock*, is to read all Heretical as well as Orthodox Books, to hear all False Prophets as well as the Teachers of Truth, Each ignorant Tradesman, Husbandman, Day-Laborer, having read the Bible, heard and read what the Dissenting Divines can say, is to Decide as Sovereign Judge, without Appeal: All are to choose thus their Religion. Not so, says St. *Paul*, *On some only is bestowed the Gift of Interpreting, on*  
*some*

*Omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete.*

1 Thes. 5.

Nolite omni Spiritui credere, sed probate Spiritus, si ex Deo sunt.

1 Joan. 4.

Quoniam multi Pseudo-Prophe-tæ exierunt in Mundum.

Alii Prophetia, alii discretio Spirituum.

1 Cor. 12. 10.

Hinc Hereses  
ortæ quod unus  
in Ecclesia Dei  
ad tempus Sa-  
cerdos, & ad  
tempus Judex  
vice Christi non  
cogitatur. l. 1.  
c. 3. *cont. Her.*  
De Ecclesia in  
Academiz por-  
ticum descen-  
dunt, sensui  
communi sed  
suo, non Eccle-  
siaz se sistunt.  
*Contr. Hermog.*  
Nil laborant  
nisi non inveni-  
re quod cre-  
dunt. l. 2. c. 2.  
*de Gen. con. Man.*  
Semper discunt  
& numquam ad  
scientiam veri-  
tatis perveni-  
unt. 2 *Tim.* 3.  
Visum est Spiritui  
Sancto &  
nobis. *Act.* 15.

*Ephes.* 4. 3, 11.

*some only the Gift of discerning Spirits.* A necessary Caution ; for as St. Cyprian observes, *Hence arise all Heresies, that People do not consider that there is one Priest in the Church of God for the time, one Judge in lieu of Christ ; but challenge each of them the Prerogative of Judging for themselves.* Heretics (says Tertullian) *abandon the Church, repair to Schools of Philosophy, (or Natural Discourse, and the Judgment of their Reason) appeal to Common Sense, but to their own, not to that of the Church.* They profess in their Creed to believe the Catholic Church, but as St. Augustin said of the Manicheans, *All they endeavor is not to find what they believe :* and having left the School of Christ, and those Teachers he had appointed them, they make good by their continual Debates about Religion, (without any fixure on a certain and unwavering Faith, without any secure Principles to build on) that Character which S. Paul gives of all Heretics, *They are ever seeking, ever learning, and never attain the science of truth.* What is their Duty then, but to seek out those to whom the infallible Direction of the Holy Ghost is promised by Christ our Lord, and accordingly given ; so that they have Authority to resolve all Doubts with a *The Holy Ghost declares this, and we declare it.* That no other Method can bring us to a steady and unwavering Faith. St. Paul did acknowledge to the Ephesians, when having warned them *To be careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,* he declares that God gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and other Pastors and Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints unto the work of the Ministry, unto the edifying of the Body of Christ, and that not for some Age or Ages only, but *until we meet all unto the unity of Faith, and Knowledge of the Son of God, into a perfect Man, into the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ ;* that is, to the last day of the General Resurrection, this Method of standing to the Decisions of such lawful Pastors being necessary : *That we be not children, wavering, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine, in the wickedness of Men in craftiness, to the circumvention of Error.* That this is the Sense of the two Texts cited in opposition to it, is most evident from the very places whence they are taken ; for St. John having advised Christians to try the Spirits, gives this standing Rule and Method for all Ages :  
He

*He that knows God (by a true Faith,) bears Us; he that is not of God, bears us not: By this Mark you shall discern the Spirit of truth from the spirit of error.* Behold St. John condemning Dr. Sherlock, who will have each Man Judge for himself of the Doctrin; whereas St. John declares we must try the Spirit only by this Mark, That they have the Spirit of God who hear with Submission their lawful Pastors, whereas those who Judge for themselves without that Deference, are certainly possessed with the Spirit of Error. 'Tis also evident, that by *U S* he means all lawful Pastors, and not the Apostles only; for they were all dead when he writ that Epistle. Could any Text be a fuller and more pressing Evidence for me, or assure us more positively, that an unerring Spirit guides the Pastors and Teachers in the Church of God; and that whoever will not fall into Error, must submit by an *Implicit Faith* to that Churches Authority, and embrace the Doctrins which she teaches by her Prelates. The other Text (so unhappy these Men are in their choice) is as full and plain to the same effect: for St. Paul having first warned the *Thessalonians* in the foregoing Verse, not to despise the Gift of Prophecy or Interpretation given to the Teachers of the Church for the Instruction of others, he bids them by this Text, not to receive all sorts of Interpreters, but such only as had received from the Holy Ghost the Gift of Prophesying, and were Commissioned by a lawful Authority to Preach: But so far he was from advising them to converse with, or read the Books of those that were Aliens and out of the Church, that he had warned before the *Ephesians*, with caution to converse with such. But let us observe the several Marks given by the Apostles and by Christ, whereby to distinguish those who are to be admitted of, from those who ought to be rejected. St. Paul gives the *Galatians* this Rule, *Whoever Preaches beside what you have received, be he accursed*; that's all the regard St. Paul bids us have for all such Innovators, as pretend to a reformation of Faith, which, as *Tertullian* teaches, is not liable to any, because 'tis not exposed to the least danger of failing, the Gates of Hell (Errors) not being permitted ever to prevail against the Church: which mov'd St. *Augustin* to declare thus his Sense: *We are certain, that no one can divide himself from the Communion of all Nations*; for

Qui novit Deum audit nos, qui non est ex Deo non audit nos: in hoc cognoscimus Spiritum veritatis & spiritum erroris. 1 Jo. 4. 6.

In sapientia ambulate cum illis qui foris sunt. Eph. 4. 5. Si quis Evangelizaverit prae-terquam id quod accepistis, anathema. Gal. 1. Irreformabilis fides.

Certi sumus neminem a communione gen-

etiam se separare potuissent, nam non quisque nostrum in sua iustitia, sed in scripturis sacris quaerit Ecclesiam, & ut promissa est reddi conspicit.

*Epist. 48.*

Dic Ecclesiae, si Ecclesiam non audierit sit tibi velut Ethnicus & Publicanus.

*Mat. 18.*

Qui in Ecclesia sunt Presbyteris obaudire oportet, qui successionem habent ab Apostolis; qui cum Episcopali successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum patris acceperunt: reliquos vero, qui abstant à Principali successione & quocunque loco colliguntur, suspectos habere vel quasi Haereticos & male sententiae, vel quasi scindentes & elatos & sibi placentes, aut rursus ut Hypocritas questus gratia & vanae gloriae hoc operantes, qui omnes decidunt à veritate. *1. 4. c. 42.*

Contradidunt multae linguae, diversae Haereses, diversa Schismata personant, linguae multae contradidunt veritati: tu curre ad tabernaculum Dei, Ecclesiam Catholicam tene, à regula veritatis noli discedere, protegeris in tabernaculo Domini à contradictione linguarum. *CC. 3. in Ps. 20.*

for not any one amongst us must seek the Church in his own Justice, (such as his own private Judgment frames) but in the Holy Scriptures, and he will find the Church, such as she is there promised. What Mark did our Blessed Lord set? In whatever Offence received from a Brother, whatever Scandal (and there is not any greater than Heresie and Schism) in case he hearken not unto, obey not the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen or a Publican; that is, have no Converse with him, separate thy self from him. Certainly this Advice of Christ is perfectly opposite to that Obligation Dr. Sherlock would impose on all. St. Irenaeus who received the true meaning of Christ's Doctrine from St. Polycarp, St. John's Disciple, understood it in a very different meaning, when in his Fourth Book against He-

resies he thus expressed himself: 'Tis necessary to obey the Priests of the Church, who have their Succession from the Apostles, who with Episcopal Succession have received a certain Grace or Gift of Truth according to the Will of the Father, all others who Separate themselves from the Principal Succession, in whatever Place they may Combine together, we must suspect as Heretics, and of a wrong Opinion; or as Schismatics, proud Men, full of the love of

themselves; or again as Hypocrites, thus dividing themselves for Interests sake and Vain-glory; who all of them are fallen from the Truth. Is this to send us to read their Books? St. Augustine also must be own'd of a very different Principle, who having stated the Case as it is at present in this Nation, gives this opposite Advice in his Third Sermon on the 30<sup>th</sup> Psalm:

Many Tongues contradict, divers Heresies, divers Schisms and Divisions speak loud, what Method is to be followed in this Case? Run you to the Tabernacle of God the Catholic Church (of which no Heresies contradicting one another can be Parts.) Do not depart from that Rule of Truth, (behold what Dr. Sherlock

blames, and calls *Implicit Faith*) you shall be protected in the Tabernacle of God from these contradicting Tongues. This is the true way, taught and followed from the beginning, of Interpreting



preting Scripture, of adhering to the genuin word of God, when the *Letter* bearing several Constructions, cannot reconcile different Opinions as the same holy Doctor observes;

*We follow in this also the Authority of Canonical Scriptures, when we follow what is Decreed by the Universal present Church, which the Authority of the Scriptures themselves recommends unto us; and because the holy Scriptures cannot deceive us, whoever fears to be misled by the obscurity of this (or any other)*

*Question, let him consult about it that Church, which we are without the least obscurity directed unto by the holy Scriptures. This he had learn'd from St. John, who assures the Members of that Church, That they are not to seek any other Masters to teach them, having that Holy Spirit (promised unto, and guiding that Church) which teaches them all truth.*

St. Paul was of a very different mind as well as Religion from Dr. Sherlock, when he orders even the Learned Bishop *Titus*, to avoid an Heretic after one or two endeavors to reclaim him, knowing that such an one is cast off, and is in sin, being condemned by his own judgment; which he opposes to that of the Church. The first General Councils, and the first Christian Emperors, were of a different Religion and mind from this Doctor, who Commanded all the Books written by Heretics to be burnt. I will conclude this Point with St. *Augustine's* Advice, perfectly opposite to these unreasonable Principles, a seasonable advice given to all Heretics wearied out with seeking in vain the truth by their own judgment, without the direction of this unerring Guide, *Return and lie at Anchor in the Haven of Catholic Faith, where no storm of a wavering curiosity can disturb you.*

Dr. Sherlock in his *Preservative*, f. 4. gives his Protestant this advice. *Ask them whether they will allow you to judge for your self in matters of Religion? If they do not, why will they trouble you with disputing? You cannot be convinced unless you*

B

Sequitur sane in hac re etiam Canoniarum Auctoritatem Scripturarum, cum hoc facimus quod universæ Jam placuit Ecclesiæ quam ipsarum Scripturarum commendat Auctoritas, &c. L. 1. Cont. Cresc. c. 31, 32, &c.

Non necesse habetis ut aliquis vos doceat, unctio enim ejus docet vos de omnibus. 1 Jsa. 2.

Hereticum hominem post unam & secundam Correctionem devota, sciens quia subversus est qui ejusmodi est & delinquit cum sit proprio iudicio condemnatus. Tit. 3. 10, 11.

Revertere & sede in portu Catholicæ fidei ubi nulla te possit fluctuosæ curiositatis tempestas turbare Aug. in Hypognost.

judge

judge too; and thereby resolve Faith into a private Spirit. --- Here let our Protestant fix his Foot, and not stir an Inch till they disown Infallibility. I observed that this was to say, 'tis impossible to convince a man that in reason he ought to submit his judgment to that of another, though infallible. That such a Principle makes void all the right use of reason, when it should lead us to submit to a just Authority: that St. Paul pretended to Infallibility through the assistance of the Spirit of God who directed him, and consequently, that if this Principle of Dr. Sherlock be reasonable, the Jews ought when he disputed in their Synagoge, not to have stirr'd an inch, not to have hearkened to him, till he had disowned infallibility. In the Defence, the Honest Footman is ashamed of so unchristian a Principle, and would disown it, saying, *That is appears plain and natural to him, that he may submit his judgment to an Infallible Judge, and yet the Church of Rome may not be that Judge, true: but this is contrary to Dr. Sherlock's Principle: For, how long is the Protestant not to stir an inch, till the Catholic hath proved his Churches infallibility? There would have been some common sense and reason in that Advice: but, not so, says Dr. Sherlock, but till he disowns infallibility.* 'Tis as evident then as Noon-day-light, that Dr. Sherlock lookt upon infallibility pretended unto, as inconsistent with disputing, and pretending by reason to convince an other of the truth, and that consequently he takes the Jews's part against St. Paul. The Footman Mistook here his Masters Errant.

*Preservative, fol. 6.* Dr. Sherlock asks this Question, *What difference is there betwixt mens using their private judgment to turn Papists or to turn Protestants?* I answered: the same as betwixt two sick men, the one whereof chooses to put himself in an able Doctors hands, whom he knows to have an infallible Remedy, whilst the other chooses his own Simples, and makes his own Medicin. As between two at Law, the one whereof is guided by his Reason to take Advice from a wise Counsellor, the other to be his own Council, &c. The Doctor's second Answers by this Question, *And is not here private Judgment used all this while?* A shrewd Question indeed. Dr. Sherlock had asked *what difference there was in these two uses of private Judgment;* I produce the difference, then



then as if the Question had been forgot, still says the *Pond-man*, there is use made of private Judgment: it were as nice a Reply, had one asked what difference is there betwixt an Ounce of Gold and an Ounce of Silver, if when the different value is express'd, he should wisely return this answer, why there is still an Ounce in both cases. Is there no difference then betwixt one who follows his fancy in choosing his way, and him who chooses a good Guide, and follows him, because both choose? do both equally rely on their fancy? What Position can more abuse common sense? Certainly the Ingenious and Learned Gentlemen of the *Temple*, cannot but smile at this strange way of Reasoning in their Master, so different from theirs.

*Preservative*, fol. 9. *They cannot with any sense dispute with us about the particular Articles of Faith, because the sense given of Scripture and Fathers, takes its Authority from the Church understanding it so.* I Replied, that the sense takes its Authority from God who spake the Word, though we are certain that we have the true sense of that Word, because we receive it from the Church, which is guided in delivering to us both the Letter and Sense by the infallible Spirit of God, that is to abide with Her for ever, according to Christs promise, *Joh. 14. 16.* I added that if *John* and *William* dispute, which is the right way to a place, *John* is not disabled of convincing *William* of his mistake, because he receives the Reasons he uses from an infallible Guide. This was plain and full: what answers the *Doctor's* second, He cites some Catholic Divines (how truly, it belongs not to my present purpose) saying, that the words of Scripture brought in proof of *Transubstantiation* might be taken in a different sense from that which the Catholic Church hath ever received and delivered: and that had not the Church ever taught that sense, one might believe otherwise for all the Letter of Scripture. Let it be so; but what follows here? But the necessity of an unerring Interpreter? So, that Text *1 Joh. 4. 7, 8.* *There be three which give Testimony in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three be one; and there be three which give testimony on Earth, the Spirit, Water, and Blood, and these three be one,* in the sense the Church hath ever received it in, proves

the strict Unity of God in the Trinity of Persons: The *Arians* gave it a contrary, and as natural a sense; doth this prove that we follow not Scripture, and this very Text in our belief of the Holy Trinity? Once more I appeal to the Learned Gentlemen of the *Temple*, hoping they will join with me, maintaining against their Master, that all the Judges of the Land may very reasonably convince by Law an impertinent Party, though he should oppose that they may not do it, because their Interpretation of the Law, is to deliver the true sense of it.

The *Preservative*, fol. 11. moves this Question. *Must the belief of an infallible Judge be resolved into every mans private judgment? Must it not be believed with a Divine Faith, and can there be a Divine Faith without an infallible Judge?* I gave this answer; There can be no Divine Faith, without a Divine Revelation, nor a prudent one without a Moral evidence in the Motives of Credibility, on which may be grounded the evident obligation to accept it. The judgment being possess'd with that Moral infallibility, rests not there, but observing that goodness and mercy of God, which cannot permit that falsehood should be propounded in his Name, with all the apparent marks of his Hand and Seal, and without any like appearance on the Contrary, inclined by a pious motion of the Will, called by the famous Council of *Orange affectio credibilitatis*, and strengthen'd by that Grace of God, which bestows the *Gift of Faith*, fastens on Gods Veracity, and with a submission not capable of any doubt, embraces the revealed truth. If the infallibility of the Church were more than Morally evident, it were impossible that any Heresy should be. To this the *Second of Dr. Sherlock* hath nothing to oppose, and is willing to submit if I can *shew a Revelation that there is an infallible visible Church*. I will comply with so reasonable a demand: and since not one in a thousand of those who oppose our Doctrine in this fundamental Point, which once being cleared, bears away all disputes, understands what that infallibility means, on which we ground the admirable certainty of each Point of our Belief, give me leave Sir, to be somewhat more prolix on this Subject than the narrow compass of a Letter would otherwise allow.

*What*

*What is, and whence proceeds this infallibility?* Many do suppose and object unto us, that we hold a Man, or many to be infallible in themselves, a Title to which God alone can lay a Claim, who only as he is *truth*, so he is alone infallible. They wilfully suppose, that we place this infallibility in the sense and judgment of men, so that whatever by their own Light they resolve and order, must infallibly be true and just; that such may frame new Articles of Faith, and a new Religion; or at least *Phanatick*-like by Enthusiasms, and new marvelous Revelations, make new additions to our Faith, so that we may have daily a different one; their Votaries like a blind Herd, being driven now to one Opinion, then to another, yet still supposing themselves infallibly right; all this is a monstrous misrepresentation, without one word of truth; but men who themselves follow a lawless fancy, and loose liberty, must thus disfigure that admirable Guide which God hath left us, otherwise they would soon be without any followers: this account I shall deliver here of the infallible Guide, which Catholics follow, *the Church of God*, will I am sure represent her in very different, because in her true proper Colours.

Our Guide then is the Catholic Church, either diffusive in its whole extent, or representative in its Head, and Bishops, the Pope, and a General Council; for as in the State here in *England*, we have a *Common Law*, and a *Statute Law*, the first not compiled by any one Lawgiver, but delivered by all the Judges and Sages of the Law, and preserved in all Courts, and the daily use of the whole Kingdom; the second delivered particularly by the Kingdoms Great Representative in its Head and Members, the King, and lawfully convened Parliaments. So in the Church there is a general Faith, first received from Christ and his Apostles, and preserved by all Bishops in their respective Diocesses, and in the mind and actions of each faithful Believer in the whole Catholic Church; and when any difficulty arises by the opposition of new Heresies, then the Church Representative the Pope, and a General Council, or Synod of the ablest and Holiest Bishops of the Catholic Church, deliver their Sentence in favour of the ancient Truth ever followed in the Church, which

which Decisions, or Canons, are like our Statute Law, only declaring, and applying to particular instances the Common Law, or Belief of the Church. We hold that this general Faith received from the Apostles, and preserved in all the Members of the Catholic Church, explained upon occasion by the Church Representative is infallibly true, and this is all the infallibility the Catholic Church pretends unto, neither the whole Church, nor any person, or persons in it, are held to possess any intrinsic infallibility, which we own to be proper to God alone. Nay no man in this present state or condition of life, as our Divines observe, can be in himself *impeccable*, or *infallible*, all are of themselves subject to Error, as well as to sin, and whatever God doth in favour of his Church, doth no more alter her defectibility, than a strong man lifting up a great weight with a Child, takes away the natural weakness of the Child, which remains still the same, though the weight not moveable to the Child, be in effect drawn or lifted up. Hence *Rufinus* observes, that we do not say in our *Creed*, I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, as we say I believe in God the Father, In Jesus Christ, In the Holy Ghost. By that Preposition, that syllable *in*, we separate the Creator from his Creatures, Divine help from *Humane means*, but we say of these humane means appointed by Almighty God, that although they be fallible, and exposed to error in their own nature, yet by Gods appointment and Grace, they will prove infallible as to us, and certainly lead to the knowledge of truth. We do not say that they cannot of themselves deceive us, but that God according to his promise directing them by his infallible Spirit; it cannot possibly happen that they should deceive us: If then says *S. Thomas* our *Creed* (as many understand it) teaches us to believe in the Catholic Church, this is the sense of it. That is to say, our Faith leans on the Holy Ghost, and the meaning of these words are, *I believe in the Holy Ghost, who sanctifies the holy Church, and Guides her.* When God revealed to *St. Paul* that he should come to *Rome* and die there, or to *St. Peter*, that being grown old he should be Crucified: were either of them *immortal*, the one, till he came to *Rome*, the other till he became old? not the least, they were as frail as before,

as

*Scotus* in 2. diff.  
2, 3. Q.

In *Symb. art.*  
*Eccless. S. Cat.*  
Hac prepositionis syllaba Creator a Creaturis secernitur, & divina humanis separantur.

Hoc est intelligendum secundum quod fides nostra refertur in Spiritum sanctum Sanctificantem Ecclesiam.

as exposed to Diseases within, as capable of being wounded and that mortally, yet in a true sense they were *immortal* for that time, because that by reason of the Revelation and protection of God, it was impossible they should die before they came the one to *Rome*, the other to old Age, according to the Revelation. Thus should God reveal to a Traveller in a wild Wilderness full of wild Beasts, and beset by Thieves, that he should *pass certainly* unhurt, and not fall, he, nor those who follow him, into the Hands of these, or Claws of those; this man would remain as weak, as ignorant of the ways, as exposed to danger as before, yet would prove an infallible Guide to those who would follow him. So supposing ( which I shall presently prove ) that God hath promised to the Catholic Church, that his holy Spirit should guide her in all truth; that she shall follow that true Guide, and ever avoid falling into Error, though each Member of the Church remain as fallible, as weak, as subject to Error as before; yet it evidently follows, that this Church will infallibly avoid all Errors, never lead any of her followers into it; and this is all we mean by the Churches infallibility? A thing when thus rightly understood, as clear, as evident, as certain, as that God's Revelation cannot prove false, as that the Holy Ghost and Christ himself ( who remains with the Teachers of this Church ) be in themselves infallible. We do not expect any new Revelations or Lights; we do not admit any new Article of Faith, though, where a doubt arises the Church hath infallibly power to declare what hath been revealed by Christ to the Apostles, and Preached by them, which perchance some part of the Church might have had a less clear understanding thereof, and though when the sense of Scripture appears doubtful to some, this Church can explain infallibly what the true sense and meaning is, and deliver more explicitly what is implied in the Word of Scripture: for example, if some doubts whether in the Mystery of our Lords Supper there be a true Change of the substance of Bread, into that of the Body of our Lord. This Holy Church can declare, that these plain words, *This is my Body*, do declare it, and to avoid further mistake, may give a new clearer Name to the old Mystery so revealed by Christ, and  
 Preached

Preached by the Apostles, calling it *Transubstantiation*; as She calls the Mystery of God, one in Nature, and three in Persons, Holy *Trinity*, a Name not found in Scripture, which so displeased the *Arians* heretofore, and *Calvin* of late; not by making any new Article of Faith, but more clearly delivering what was ever believed by the Apostles, and all Catholics from their time to this: so that still we own *Sancta Scriptura sufficienter Continent omnem scientiam Necessariam Viatori*. That Holy Scripture contain, all that is necessary to a Christian to know in this life; and with *Bellarmin*, *Non est de fide nisi quod Deus, per Apostolos, aut Prophetas revelavit, aut quod evidenter inde deducitur*. That nothing is of Faith, but what Christ revealed by the Prophets, or Apostles, or what is Evidently deduced from it. The Church being only our Guide to the understanding of the true and full sense of Scripture. This Pope *Celestin* owned to the General Council of *Ephesus*; *Agendum nunc est ut Labore Communi Credita & per Apostolorum successione detenta servemus*. That the whole work of the Church representative is only to Conserve by a clear Exposition of it, what the Church diffusive retained in a continual Succession, as first taught by the holy Apostles, and so continually by their Successors. This is all the Council of *Trent* pretended unto: For Councils, says an Eminent Member of it, have the assisting presence of the Holy Ghost, only to declare those Articles infallibly true, which Christ from the beginning revealed; And Secondly, When Errors and Abuses arise to a growth, to gather infallibly from what hath been revealed, those Truths, which all Christians are bound to believe, and to follow in Faith and Manners. *Ad Extirpandos errores, & abusos infallibiliter, etiam ex revelatis Colligere populo Christiano credenda & usurpanda in fide & moribus*. Then continues the same. They are gathered in the Name of Christ, when they declare only such things, as were revealed by Christ, and brought down to us in the Holy Scripture, or certain Apostolical Traditions. The Apostles themselves used no other Method, and *St. Paul* as Infallible as he was, owned, That he presumed to teach only what he had from Christ, to which witness was born by Miracles. *Non Audio aliquid loqui eorum quae*

Scetus Q. 2.  
prologi.

Ep. 7.

Vega.

Rom. 15.

per



*Per me non efficit Christus in veritate signorum.* And this infallible Certainty we allow to the Church only in such things, as She declares necessary to be known, and believed in order to our Salvation, not in impertinent or indifferent things; For we say still with *Tertullian*, *Nobis curiositate non opus est post Christum, inquisitione post Evangelium.* We seek not curiously into anything, but what is clearly revealed; but what was taught when the Gospel was first preached. Our Church then hath not power to make new Articles of Faith, nor ever pretended to it, but is a mere yet infallible Witness to the anciently revealed ones: In Her Name *Tertullian* declares, *Nobis nihil licet ex nostro arbitrio inducere, Apostolos Domini habemus Auctores, qui nec ipsi quidquam de suo arbitrio elegerunt quod inducerent.* Ibidem.

*We can bring in nothing of our choice, the Apostles are the Authors of what we teach, who themselves taught nothing of themselves.* Christ promised to be with them, and their Successors till the end of the World, only in order to the declaring of these things, which he himself revealed and taught especially in those forty days betwixt his Resurrection and Ascension, when he taught them all that concerned the Kingdom of God on Earth, his Church. Mat. 28.

The infallibility of the Church being thus Expounded, and such is that which Catholics believe, and are guided by; I cannot conceive how any Christian can object any thing against it, who believes that what God revealed must necessarily be true, and that Christ and the Holy Ghost be infallible. I proceed then to prove that God hath revealed the Catholic Church should ever be guided by his holy Spirit, and ever follow that Guide, and never fall into any Error in Faith, and to do it most convincingly against all Sectaries, I will prove it by the Texts of Holy Scripture, such as their very Bible offers, and this not by two or three, which would suffice, but by a number, and that I may not seem to give my own sense to those Texts, I will join to them the Exposition of the Holy Fathers, given in all Ages, according to the sense of the Catholic Church.

By the Catholic Church I mean not only the Church of all Ages, but the whole Church of any Ages, and consequently

*Omnia quaecunque mandavi vobis. Et loquens de regno dei.*

the Catholic Church of this Age, for it is the same Church, there being but *One*, as all our Creed teaches us. I say as the *Jews* did yield a full belief to God, and his *Servant Moses*; to God as the author of their Faith, and to *Moses* as the Propounder and Witness of it; so each Catholic in any Age believes God and the Church of his Age, that Church being *Causa Exemplaris*, the Pattern and Exposition of his Faith.

That this Church is an infallible Witness to all that Christ did teach, is evident from the Commands laid upon us by the Prophets, by Christ our Lord, by the Apostles, to receive with an entire submission all that it delivers, for it is inconsistent with Gods infinite Veracity, that he should oblige us to believe an Error. Almighty God by *Isay*, teaches us, that *all Nations shall resort unto Her as a Judge*. Adding, *Every tongue resisting thee in judgment, thou shalt condemn; and, the Nation and Kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish*. The plain reason for it is given by *Ezekiel*, where God promises that when Controversies arise, he will decide by his Churches Verdict, *They shall stand in judgment, and shall judge according to my Judgment*. Hence St. *Augustin* looking upon the judgment of the Church as certainly that of God, declares; the only reason, why St. *Cyprian*, though in an Error, yet was no Heretic, to be, because his Error was not yet Condemned by the Churches Representative, a General Council: That a *most firm belief* is to be yielded to such Decisions, and that *Not to submit to the Church is the highest impiety, or the most rash arrogance*. In fine, that by the Authority of such Councils, *Truth is settled and confirmed, and all doubts are removed*. The Oracle of Christ our Lord in this case stands, *Mat. 8. If he submit not to the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen and a Publican*. This St. *Cyprian* was convinced of when he declared, *That no one can have God for a Father, who pays not to the Church the submissive Duties which a Mother hath right to challenge; that as no one out of the Ark escaped death in the Deluge, so no one can avoid perishing, if he revolts*

*Exod. 14.*  
Crediderunt  
domino &  
Moyli servo  
ejus.

*Isay 2. 3. 54. 7.*  
*Ezek. 44.*

Nondum plenario Concilio de-  
cisus. l. 1. c. 18.  
de Bapt.  
Certissimam fi-  
dem. ibid. c. 9.  
c. 4.  
Nolle primasda-  
re vel sumae im-  
pietatis est, vel  
præcipitis arro-  
gantiae. De util.  
Cred. c. 17.  
Donec plenario  
torius orbis  
Concilio, quod  
saluberrime sen-  
tiebatur etiam  
remotis dubita-  
tionibus firmaretur.  
Habere enim vivere foris possunt, cum Domus Dei una sit; Et nemini salus esse nisi in  
Ecclesiâ possit. Cyp. de Unit.

from



from the Church, that no one can live (to God) and be out of her Obedience, because that God hath but one House, and no body can be saved out of the Church. Next the practice of the Apostles, for as we find *Acts 15.* there being a debate about the Obligation that Christians lay under in reference to the Law, they appointed Paul and Barnabas to go up, and certain others of the rest, to the Apostles and Priests unto Hierusalem upon this Question—There was made a great disputation, and the Conclusion was, this Decision of the Church; It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and unto us, &c. according to the Promise made by Christ, *Joh. 15. 16.* When the Paraclete comes, He shall give testimony to me, and You shall give testimony to me; which words assert the future perpetual union in the same sense, betwixt the Invisible infallible Spirit, and the Visible Church: Hence St. Cyril, Patriarch of Hierusalem, owned the true Church to be called Catholic, not only by reason of her Continuation in all Ages, and extent into all places, but also by reason that She teaches Catholically, that is, Universally, without any Error or Variance all that a Christian ought to know, submitting piously to her Authority all sorts of men, both Princes and People. St. Paul though an Inspired Scripture-writer, owned this Ordinary Authority as the only sure Guide, saying of himself (*Gal. 2. 1.* I went up according to Revelation) God ordering it for our Example, and instruction) and conferred with them the Gospel which I preached——lest perhaps I should have run or had run in vain. Not that the Churches approbation added any thing to the truth which had been revealed to him, whence he says, To me those that seemed to be something, added nothing. So now the Churches Authority addeth nothing to the truth revealed in Scripture, but offers infallibly that truth to be obey'd. In which sense St. Augustin owned, that he would not believe the Gospel, were he not moved to it by the Authority of the Catholic Church; to wit, the present one then declaring against the Manicheans: for the Church, as St. Cyprian had observed before him, that is, the people united to their Priests, the Flock adhering to their

Ecclesia vocatur Catholica quia docet Catholice, hoc est, universaliter & sine ullo defectu, vel differentia, omnia dogmata quæ debent venire in cognitionem. — Omne hominum genus pie subjugat Principes & privatos. Cyr. Hier. Catech. 2.

Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholice Ecclesie commoveret Autoritas ad Ep. fund-

c. 5. Esti contumax & superba obundare volentium multitudo, Ecclesia tamen à Christo non recedit, Et illi sunt Ecclesia plebs sacerdoti adunata, & Pastori suo grex adherens. Ep. 69.

*Pastor, never falls off from Christ, though stubborn and proud multitudes of men fall off from Her. How can God abandon the Church to Errors, and yet give her Teachers and Pastors the Power to exact a full submission of judgment, this St. Paul bears witness unto ( 2 Cor. 10. ) The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, casting down all imaginations or reasonings, and every thing that exalts it self against the knowledge, and bringing into Captivity all understanding in obedience to Christ, and he declares to the Ephesians, ( 4. 11. before cited ) that these Pastors, whose teaching will preserve us from wavering, and from being tost to and fro, will still be until we all come unto the unity of Faith, until the Body of Christ be built, which will not be compleat till the Worlds End.*

Yet our Merciful God to bear away all cavilling excuses of those who should preterd the Church to have been left and abandoned by her Teacher, the infallible Spirit of God, hath most clearly ingaged his unerring Word for the contrary. *This is my rest, ( says he by David ) for ever and ever here will I dwell, because I have chosen it. And St. Paul assures us, that this House of God is the Church of the living God, to omit the greater number of these Promises by Isay, he offers these: Thou shalt be no more forsaken ( as the Synagogue ) but thou shalt be called my delight in her : upon thy Walls, Hierusalem, I have appointed Watchmen all the day and all the night, ( in the calm of Peace and in the storms of Persecution ) for ever they shall not hold their peace. — There shall come a Redeemer to Sion, and to them that shall return from iniquity in Jacob, says our Lord, as for me, this is my Covenant with them, my Spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy Seed, nor out of the mouth of thy Seeds Seed, from the present and for ever, by Hieremy he promises, I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me for ever, I will make an everlasting Covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, but will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me. By Ezechiel he thus expresses himself, There shall be one Shepherd over them, all they shall walk in my Judgements. — I will set my Sanctuary in the midst of them for ever.*

By

By *Malachy* thus, *I will make her who was cast off* ( the Church gathered amongst the *Gentils* ) *a strong Nation, and the Lord shall reign over them, from hence forth and for ever.* And by the Prophet *Osee*, he assures that Church, *That he hath Espoused her by Faith for ever.* Was it possible that God should reveal more expressly, more fully, that his Church should never fail to follow the directions of her Guide the Holy Ghost? what wonder that all holy Fathers should continually deliver us a truth, of which they had received so frequent and plain Revelations? *St. Cyprian* following the Prophet *Osee*, assures us, that *this Spouse* of Christ can never fall into Adultery, must remain Chaste and unstained, ever dwell in One House, and that consequently who ever forsakes her, and adheres to an *Adulteress* ( any Heretical or Scismatical Congregation ) loses all right to the Promises made to the Church. So certain was *St. Gregory Nazianzen* that this Church could never admit any *Heretics* into her Communion, That as zealous an opposer as he was to the *Apollinarists*, he owned he would acquiesce to them if they could prove they had ever been received into the Catholic Churches Communion, which would be an undoubted proof that they were fallen into no Heresie. And in that case it could not be otherwise but that they did assent to truth. *St. Athanasius* owned this Rule so infallible, that he conceived no other Arguments ought to be used against Heretics but this, which alone, is sufficient; that their Opinion was not the Doctrine of the Orthodox Church, that our Ancestors were of another persuasion. But what debate can there be of this truth amongst Christians after so plain a decision of Christs own Divine Mouth ( *Matt.* 16. 18. ) *The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against her*; having first assured *Peter* that he was a Rock ( unmoveable ) and that on that Rock he would build his Church. On *Peter* then and his Successors, not on their Shoulders indeed ( as a Protestant Divine very briskly proved ) but on their perso-

Adulterari non potest sponsa Christi, incorrupta est & pudica, unam domum novit. — Quisquis ab Ecclesiâ segregatus Adulteræ jungitur, à promissis Ecclesiæ separatur. *Cypri. de Unit. Eccles.*

Si nunc vel ante suscepti sunt qui Apollinaris placita sectantur, hoc ostendant & nos acquiescemus. Perspicuum enim Erit eos ut recte Doctrinæ assentientes susceptos fuisse, nec enim se res aliter habere potest si hoc consequuti sunt.

*Epist. ad Cledon.* Tantummodo ad ea respondendum est, quod ipsum per se sufficit, ea Ecclesiæ Orthodoxæ noti esse, nec Majores nostros ita sensisse. *Epist. ad Epist. Epist. Corint.*

nal unmoveable Faith this Church is ever to be built ; whence all holy Fathers have ever derived the Infallibility of Doctrin promised to the Church : Let the great Patriarch of *Alexan-*

*Petram opinor per agnominatio-*  
nem nihil aliud quam inconcussam &  
firmissimam discipuli fidem vocavit,  
in qua Ecclesiâ Christi ita fundata &  
firmata esset, ut non laberetur &  
esset inexpugnabilis inferorum por-  
tis in perpetuum manens. *Cyril. in*  
*Dial. ad Prin. l. 4*

*dria S. Cyril* be an Instance of it : *This Sir-*  
*name of Rock* (says he) *is the unmoveable and*  
*most firm Faith of this Disciple, on which the*  
*Church of Christ should be so founded and set-*  
*led, that it should prove impregnable to the*  
*Gates of Hell, lasting for ever.* And that all  
might know, that 'tis the virtue of the

Holy Ghost, by whose Infallibility in Guiding, the Church re-  
mains Infallible in being Guided, our Saviour informs his Apo-  
stles of it, and us by them, *Joh. 14. 16. He (my Father) will*  
*give you another Paraclete, that may abide with you for ever, (and*  
*consequently with their Successors, as a Land given to one for*  
*ever, by force thereof belongs to his Heirs) the Spirit of Truth,*  
*whom the World knows not.* *St. Ambrose*, who observed no such  
Promise made to particular Men reading Scripture, had hence  
reason to conclude, *Let no Man make the*

*Nemo fidem suam intra mensuram*  
legis includat, sed ad Ecclesiam con-  
ferat, in qua sepiiformis Spiritus gra-  
tia relucet, quam Princeps ille Sacer-  
dotum fulgore supernæ divinitatis il-  
luminat. *Lib. 7. c. 11. in Luc.*

*Law the measure of his Faith, but report it to*  
*the Church in which the Grace of the seven-fold*  
*Spirit shines, whom that Prince of the Priests*  
*doth enlighten with Rays of the Divinity from*  
*above.* Hence *Origen* concuded, *That the*

*Lib. 6. contra*  
*Cels.*

*Son of God, as the Scriptures teach us, is the Soul of the Body of*  
*Christ, which is the Church of Christ.—That the Word of God by a*  
*wonderful Virtue moves together all the Members of his Church :*  
*And can it enter into a Christians thought, that a Body gui-*  
*ded by the Holy Ghost, moved by Christ, shall ever go astray ?*  
*But Tertullian* represents with a most sensible Energy the  
weakness of those who can harbor the least suspicion of it.  
*The Holy Ghost* (says he) *to this intent was sent by Christ, to this*  
*end was asked of the Father, that he should be the Teacher of Truth ;*  
*Did this Steward of God neglect his Office ? Did this Vicar of*  
*Christ permit the Church to believe, to teach otherwise than Christ*  
*himself Preached by his Apostles ?* *St. Paul* did not believe it  
possible, when he called the Church not only *the House of God,*  
but also *the Pillar of Truth.* I omit here those plain Texts  
of Scripture to be found so frequently in it, by which Christ  
declares

declares this Churches Perpetuity, only minding you, Sir, of that Saying of one of the most famous and Learned Primates of this Kingdom, *'Tis the same in the Church to Err and to Perish.* Wherefore since the latter cannot happen, if God in revealing cannot Err, we may conclude with him, that to say it can Err, is a *Sacrilegious Vanity* which the *Authority of the Prophets, of the Gospels, of the Fathers* utterly reproveth. That what Promises were made to the Apostles for the Support and Continuance of the Church, are made good to their Successors, the lawful Pastors, Reason it self evidently makes out, God not withdrawing the Means whilst he designs the End. And St. *Augustin* expresses it fully in these words, Commenting on those of the Royal Prophet, *For thy Fathers, Children are born to thee : The Apostles did beget thee, they were sent, they Preached, they were thy Fathers, but could they remain for ever with us ? Was then the Church deserted by their departure ? God forbid ! For thy Fathers, Children were born to thee, Bishops were Constituted.— Think not thy self abandon'd, because thou seest not Peter, thou seest not Paul : Out of thy Issue Fathers are given thee.* Hence in his Dispute he wonder'd at the senseless Position of *Gaudenium* Lib. 2. c. 8. contra *Donatist*, teaching that the Church had Perished, and yet owning their Congregation to be the true Church ; since *Donatus* could not be a Father in the true Church, had he not been a Son thereof, had he Perished before he laid the Foundation of his Schismatical Body ? Against the same Heretics and the Schismatics of these Days he is as plain on the Psal. 103. *What mean some* (says he in the Name of the Church) *who abandoning me, murmur against me ? How do those lost Men pretend that I Perish ? for they say I was and am not. Tell me (O Lord) how short are my days, how long I shall last on Earth : And be announced it to me, and said, Behold, I am with you to the end of Ages. What can be said more plain ?* This Church then, or this Communion with lawful Bishops, this *Universal Communion*, as St. *Augustin* calls it, will ever be guided by the Holy Ghost infallibly in the

Idem est errare & perire Ecclesiam.—Hanc sacrilegam vanitatem evertit Evangelica veritas, & Prophetarum atque SS. Patrum non violanda auctoritas. *Lanfranc. contr. Bereng.*

Genuerunt te Apostoli, ipsi missi sunt, ipsi predicatorum, ipsi patres ; sed numquid nobiscum ipsi semper esse poterunt. Ergo eorum discessu deserta est Ecclesia ? Absit, pro Apostolis nati sunt tibi filii, constituti sunt Episcopi, &c. *Aug. in Psal. 44.*

Lib. 2. c. 8. contra *Gaudenium*.

Quid est quod nescio, qui recedentes à me murmurent contra me ? quid est quod peridi me perisse contendunt ? certe enim hoc dicunt quia sum & non sum. Annuntia mihi paucitatem dierum meorum, quam diu ero in hoc seculo, & annuntiavit, & dixit, ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem seculi, totius orbis Communio. *Aug. l. 2. c. 2. cont. Gaud.*

k knowledge

knowledge of Truth. They believe right who are in this Communion, they are in Error who are out of it : This is the most palpable and most secure way of discerning the Truth. Wherefore St. *Augustin* tells us, that disputing against *Fortunatus* an Heretical Bishop, he pressed him (but in vain) to answer one Question, pretending that the Answer to it would, as it was manifest to all, clear their Controversie, Whether he could give Letters of Communion (which should be accepted of by Bishops in all Parts of the World) *whither ever he should assign him*. We ask Protestant Bishops here the same Question; and because there is not One Bishop in the whole World, out of his Majesty's Dominions, that will own their Doctrin, and acknowledge himself of the same Church with them, we conclude with St. *Augustin*, that there is no need of a farther Debate, it being evident they belong not unto, and are no part of the Catholic Church: and they may share betwixt us and themselves this Sentence of St. *Augustin's* Scholar S. *Prosper* : *A Christian in Communion with this Universal Church, is a Catholic, if separated from it, an Heretic.* ; which is the very Sentence of St. *John* in the very Text which Dr. *Sherlock's* Footman cited against me. I have been somewhat profuse on this Subject, because it is of the greatest importance, and to shew what silly Questions are proposed unto us as unanswerable, to which each Leaf of Scripture, each holy Father yield a ready Answer against them, and for us.

Querebam utrum Epistolae Communicatorias, quas formatas dicimus, posset, quo vellem, dare; & affirmabam, quod manifestum esset omnibus, hoc modo facillime illam terminari posse questionem.

*Aug. Ep. 163.*

Huic generali Ecclesiae communicans Christianus Catholicus est, ab hac segregatus Haereticus.

*S. Prosper. in dim. temp. c. 3.*

*Profer. Fol. 17.*

*No understanding Protestant can be disputed into this kind of Popery, which owns an Infallible Church: First, because no Arguments or Disputations can give me an infallible certainty of the Infallibility of the Church.*

*Answer.*

I observed, that this way of Reasoning was a Plea for the Jews against Christ our Lord; this Position proving, that Christ our Lord, who own'd himself Infalible, did imprudently to Preach or work Miracles, by which he exacted a certain firm Faith grounded upon his Infalibility in Teaching: for since his Preaching and Miracles did not give an *Evident infallible certainty* of his Infalibility, (and such an evident one Dr. *Sherlock* must mean, for the certainty we have of a real



a real Infallibility cannot be in reality Fallible) no prudent Jew or Gentile could be disputed by *Christ* into Faith. Arguments so offensive to pious Ears, ought to meet with no other Answer than Prayers for him who offers them.

First, he tells me the Arguments which I call offensive to pious Ears are mentioned 1 Tim. 4. 3. Next, he asks me, Whether my Reasons and Arguments for my Churches Infallibility, and those which *Christ* offered with the addition of Miracles, hold a Comparison? Thirdly, he tells me, that *Christ*, tho' Infallible, tho' he wrought Miracles to confirm his Doctrin, did not command them to be content with an Implicit Faith, but the contrary: Search the Scripture, Joh. 5. 39. and Mark 12. 24. tells them they Erred, not knowing the Scripture. Then he concludes, that Dr. Sherlock, did not say that the Jews could not be disputed into Faith, unless that Faith were infallible: No, he leaves that to be talked of by us, who are the great Pretenders to it.

Defence Fol. 7.

An Error ever draws on a greater to its defence, and *Heresie* seldom supports her self without *Blasphemy*; we have both here in store. As for his first Observation, I understand not the meaning of it, the Text hinted at being this, *There shall be time when they will not bear sound Doctrin, but according to their own desires they will heap to themselves Masters, having itching Ears.* I blamed not the Hearers, but the Teacher; and in this particular Case I am very well satisfied, that the witty and Learned Gentlemen of the Temple, are so far from hearing this Doctrin of Dr. Sherlock with itching Ears, that they pity his Ignorance, and blame his forwardness, and blush at so weak and ill-knit a piece of Sophistry; and therefore I willingly submit what I write in this Engagement, to their Censure. As to the Question he asks me, his ignorance of our Belief prompts it to him: For we believe our Church Infalible by the Infalibility of *Christ* who remains with her, and of the Holy Ghost who guides her into all Truths: And for this we bring the same Proofs, to wit, Prophecies, *Christ's* Preaching it, and his Miracles Confirming it, besides the continual visible Event of *Christ's* Prophecies concerning his Church. This Question then is very silly.

But his two Proofs are in another Strain; by the First he

D

intimates,

intimates, That *Christ* could not have challeng'd an *Implicit Faith* reasonably from the *Jews*: A Position which, to the shame of *Christianity*, this last Age and pretended *Reformation* hath often offered and supported: Contrary to *Christ's* own Sacred words, who often urged the *Jews* to believe his words on the account of his miraculous *Works*, by which if he had not proved the truth of his words, he owned that *they had not had sin*. The Matter is finely merded, and *Christianity* is brought by these Men to a fair pass, when *Christ's* words are not to be believed by an *Implicit Faith*. The Church of God, tho' *Infallible*, sends as much to the Scriptures as *Christ* did, since that she offers each Point of the Faith she teaches, as delivered immediately or mediately in the Holy Scriptures. The Prophecies of himself which *Christ* cited, were indeed to be sought and found in the Scriptures; but 'tis a pleasant Fancy to apply those words, *Search the Scriptures*, to all that *Christ* did teach; as if the Gospels, and whatever *Christ* did Preach, contained no new Revelations, nothing but what could be found in the *ancient Testament*. A great stock of Patience is necessary to answer calmly such Impertinencies as are brought to support the Errors with which these late Heresies are patch'd up. But the last Defence brought for Dr. *Sherlock* is surprising, and I could well quarrel with you, Sir, (as a Christian) for Licensing it. What, do you own that we only are to look on the Faith even as Preached by *Christ*, as necessarily *Infallible*? Is it no part of your Belief that you are any way concerned in, that that certain Faith which *Christ* exalted from the *Jews*, *St. Paul* from each Christian, must of necessity be *Infallible*?

*Preservative.*

'Tis impossible by Reason to prove, that Men must not make use of their own Reason and Judgment in Matters of Religion.

*Answer. Fol. 5.*

That Men must use Reason to come to this Knowledge, that God hath revealed what they believe, is very certain. As the *Jews*, *Exod. 14. Crediderunt Domino & Moysi servo ejus, Did believe God and Moses his Servant*; As all Nations believed *Christ* and his Apostles; So each Christian now believes *Christ* and his Church; the first as Author, the second as Witnesses (Commission'd from God) of their Faith, being moved by the Proofs they offered of their Commission. So far Judgment: Thus the Apostles believed *Christ* teaching himself to be the Son



Son of God, their Judgment having first been convinced that God spoke by him ; which Method appears more particularly in the Man born blind whom *Christ* our Lord cured, and who was thereby convinced that *God was with him*, taught by him ; and in consequence to that Conviction, having barely heard from *Christ*, that he was the Son of God, *he fell prostrate and adored him*, not exacting any farther proof beyond his Word. After a full conviction that God speaks by those who Preach to us, there is no farther use of Reason, if we believe *St. Paul*, but in order to the bringing into captivity all Understanding in obedience to Faith. 2 Cor. 13.

Nisi Dominus  
esset cum illo.

Defence f. 7, 8. If my Sense and Reason will serve me to find out an Infallible Church, it is a little severe to renounce it when I come there.—The Apostles were as Infallible as the Church can pretend to be now, yet 1 Epist. John 4. 1. *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, if they be of God.* 1 Cor. 10. 15. *I speak to wise Men, judge you what I say.* And Acts 17. 11. we have this particular Commendation of the *Bereans*, that they were more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily to see whether what they heard, were conformable thereto or no.

Answer. Do I renounce my Reason, when I embrace what my Reason hath convinced me to be infallibly true? Sure, Sir, you have too much Sense, not to own this to be a senseless Position. But let us apply it to another Case. When a Protestant is convinced, and that, if you please, infallibly, that the Word of God in the Bible delivers a Truth, and his Reason hath convinced him of it, is he not to abandon whatever Reason can object against the Mystery? If you say he is not, then a Man may doubt of the truth of Gods Word. A very Christian Protestant Principle! If you say he is, then 'tis not severe, but most reasonable, to renounce Reason when it opposes it self to a Truth infallibly Preached, and received from an Authority acknowledged Infallible. As for the three Texts, I have before shewed how the First is wrested from its plain natural Sense to the opposite. The Third is against him ; for the Bereans received (First) the Word with all readiness of mind, and (then) searched the Scriptures, to see in them those Texts which the Apostles used to convince the stubborn, and so do Ca-

tholics. The *Second* is neither directly nor indirectly to the purpose: For *St. Paul* having brought a *Reason* why they were to abstain from such Meat and Drink as was offered to Idols, to wit, that since they did partake of the true Sacrifice of *Christ's* Body and Blood, they could no more use what was Sacrificed to Idols, than serve at two opposite Altars, and adore the true God and the false ones, he asks them, Whether *this Reason is not convincing?* Now I would know whether a Supreme Judge (much more an infallible one) doth disclaim his own Power, because he offers evident Reasons for the Sentence he gives, and shews the Parties obstinacy, that should refuse to submit to them? As for those words, *As to wise Men I speak*, the honest Footman little understands the meaning of them; it being the Language of the Primitive Church, when any thing was touched concerning the great Sacrament of our Blessed Lord's Body and Blood, not to publish that high Mystery, but to refer to the private Instruction about it, which was given after Baptism, and never trusted to the Catechumens: an evident Proof, that in this Sacrament there was a high Mystery beyond the Faith in Christ our Redeemer, as Saviour of the World, and Food of our Souls by his Passion, without which no one was admitted to Baptism.

Thus *St. Augustin* ever expressed himself in this Subject: *The Faithful know what I mean, those understand me that have been Christened.* Thus *Origen* and *St. Chrysostom* before him, and *St. Paul* himself: I speak to you more boldly of this Mystery, as to the wiser and more fully taught. Pray, Sir, leave off Licencing such wretched Trifles, and such wonderful wrested Texts, or never expect there should be any Answer returned to them; tho' how far this Motive will prevail with you, I have some small reason to doubt.

Preserv. f. 21. *We have as much assurance of every Article of our Faith, as you have of the Infallibility of your Church; First, because we are in general assured, that the Scriptures are the Word of God.*

Answer f. 5. This is the great Point indeed, which if a Protestant loses, he loses all: For, 'tis certain and evident, that the Catholic hath the same assurance for each Article of his Faith proposed by the Church, which he hath of the Churches

Norunt fideles,  
norunt qui Initiati sunt. In  
Ps. 39. & 33.  
& Ps. 109.  
Hom. 42. c. 4.  
l. 50. Hom.  
Orig. in Levit.  
Hom. 9.  
Chrys. Hom. 27.  
in Gen. Hom. 5.  
ad Antioch, &c.

Churches infallibility, (as I have the same certainty of all that my Friend says to me, which I have that he speaks nothing but certain truth.) He proves it first, *because he is in general assured that the Scriptures are the Word of God*; Hitherto there holds some parity though but lame; but suppose it were entire, the Conclusion would be this, *Catholics are as certain of the sense of Scripture as Protestants are that they have the Letter*; whence it follows demonstratively, that when Protestants differ in the sense from Catholics, they have less assurance for it than Catholics, who have always the same assurance for the sense as Protestants have for the Letter.

*Defence, f. 6. and 7.* You are Judges in your own Case (about infallibility) — We have the concurrent testimony of all Churches, that we have those Canonical Books. — But let us suppose a while, that your Church were infallible, what greater certainty (*for that is the point you know which the Doctor was upon*) have you of it, than we have of any particular Point of Faith? as for the certainty of Reason and Argument, That we have, and would fain see you shew more. What we believe is according to Scripture, and doth not Contradict either Sense or Reason, nor any other Principle of Knowledge.

*Answer.* Never was a starved Cause so pitifully defended: No wonder a Footman only doth not blush to appear in its Defence; the Learned and judicious Gentlemen of the Temple had each of them too much Honor, Conscience, and Wit, and therefore none of them would Patronize so wretched a Cause, and support such weak Contradictions as the Excellent Master of the Temple, (so the Preface-maker calls him) had blundered out. Pray Sir review this last Discourse, blush that your License Authorises it, and hereafter have some care of your Reputation, and set not your Name to such Stuff. This is the Case: on one side, there is supposed an Infallible Interpreter of the Christians great Law-Book; (for thus Dr. Sherlock states the Case) on the other are some men, (far the greater part unlearned and weak) who allow not any sense to this Book, which seems to them to Contradict either (*their*) Sense or Reason, or any other Principle of (*their*) Knowledge. And I am asked whether I proceed more prudently

idently in receiving the sense of the Law from that Interpreter ( which is actually supposed infallible ) or in proceeding by the second method. Sir, if you are so weak or wilful, as not to declare that I have a greater certainty in submitting to that infallible Interpreter, your Counsel is not worth the asking, and I appeal to that of the judicious Gentlemen of the Temple. But I must not omit the untruth couched in those words, *We have the Concurrent Testimony of all Churches, that we have those Canonical Books*; For no part of the Catholic Church, no part of the Greek *Schismatic* Churches, own the same Canon of Scripture-Books which you do.

*Preservative, Ibid. In particular we are assured that the Faith which we profess is agreeable to Scripture.*

*Answer, fol. 5.* If he means they have the same Proofs for this, which Catholics have for the infallibility of the Church, that is, for the Continued Being of that Church, which assures us that She is infallible in directing us, (for a Church Erring in so Fundamental a Point, would cease to be the Church of Christ) then, it is evidently false, since each Christian in this Age, hath the same Evidence of Her being the Church of Christ, and of Her teaching all Truth, and consequently of Her being (as She declares) infallible in thus teaching, which he hath of Christ, to wit, the ancient Prophecies, those of Christ himself; his Miracles, and the Miracles wrought in that Church, according to the Promises of Christ, besides the Conversion of Nations to Christianity, &c. These things *Protestants* do not so much as pretend unto, as Proofs of their particular Sense in Interpreting Scripture.

*Defence, fol. 10.* This is a pretty Conceit, the infallibility of the Church, that is to say, the Being of the Church; can't a Church be without being infallible. — We have heard much of Miracles, but could never see any.

*Answer.* Do you allow such Answers Sir, that have so little of Sense and less of Piety? Can a Church remain the Church of Christ, and yet teach her self to be infallibly guided by the Spirit of Christ, whilst she is abandon'd to the Spirit of Error, and that so far as Idolatry, and the Evacuating of the Passion of Christ? Are we come to own that

*Herod*

Herod might well be excus'd from believing in Christ, because he had heard much of his Miracles, but could never see any? Well Sir, when you License such an other Discourse, add to your Titles that of a *Christian*, that we may think you are one.

*Preservative, fol. 23.* If you must not use your Reason and private judgment, then you must not by any Reasons be persuaded to condemn the use of Reason.

*Answer. f. 5.* I never heard so much, and so little of Reason. — All he says, might with equal weight be said by a sick Man, who dissuaded from choosing his own Remedies, and desired to send for a skilful Doctor, should answer, 'Tis impossible by Reason to persuade me not to use my Reason, in governing my self by Reason as my own Reason teaches me, which would be to Condemn Reason, and yet be guided by your Reason, or the Doctor's Reason. Such a Discourse would prove the Sick party at least somewhat light-headed: What 'tis a Symptom of in Dr. Sherlock I will not be positive.

*Defence, f. 11.* Is this Sick Man persuaded to renounce his Reason, or rather is it not that he should submit his judgment (not renounce his Reason) in that case to that Person whom he hath all the reason in the world to believe hath better knowledge, and understanding of those things which are to be used for his recovery than himself? And all this while methinks he is governed by Reason, though he doth not think fit to trust his own skill. — But this bears no comparison, Religion is, or ought to be the Concern of all.

*Answer.* The Footman prevaricates here, or is ashamed of his Master's gross Sophistry, and will not stand by it. 'Tis Dr. Sherlock who pretends that a Catholic by following an infallible Guide renounces his Reason; I contend that all the while he is governed by Reason, and chiefly, because that in a matter of that Concern, he thinks not fit to trust his own skill: which God hath as often declared to be too weak in any private person, as he hath declared he would give to all, such Pastors and Teachers as should guide them, and Commanded each to repair to them, to be guided by them. But Religion is or ought to be the Concern of all, a wise Observation! So is, or ought to be each ones health, and the preservation of his life:

life: as therefore each one ought to advise with a good Doctor concerning his Health, a good Lawyer for the preservation of his Fortune; so, and much more with a good Guide, and (since it can be had) an infallible one, for the securing of his Souls eternal happiness: the Practice of Religion is the duty of all; but the teaching it, of those Doctors whom God hath appointed to that end, as *St. Paul* teaches us *Eph. 4.* is not this Sir, a most evident truth?

*Preservative, f. 25. Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve;* is such a plain and express Scripture, that no reason can justify the Worship of another Being.

*Ans. f. 6.* A rare Consequence! to Infer a Negative for an Affirmative Antecedent, that bears no opposition with it. 'Tis like this, a *Subject must love his King, and pay Allegiance to him alone;* therefore no Reason can justify the love of a Man for his Wife, or of a Child for his Father. *St. Augustin* drew from that very Text the contrary Conclusion, he takes off all blame from *Abraham*, who is said in *Genesis* to have Adored or Worshipped the People of the Land, because 'tis observable (says the Holy Doctor) That in the Commandment 'tis not said thou shalt Worship God alone, as it is said, and him alone thou shalt serve; which in Greek is λατρεύου, for such a service (of Latria) is given to God alone.

*Defence, f. 12. What a delicate piece of Sophistry is here? The Commandment is to serve God only,* which service we must of necessity understand to be that which is Divine, but Worship is so. --- Therefore the Text is plain against the Worship of any other but God.

*Ans.* All that is plain in this Answer is, that men necessarily want a Guide in the interpreting of Scripture, and that an infallible one also, for such is the pride of some men, that even an ignorant Foot-man (as you see) thinks he understands the Bible better than the Holiest and most Learned of Doctors *S. Augustin*, and what reason teaches of the Service of God better than the most enlightened Patriarchs. *Abraham* Worships men: *S. Augustin* declares that the Commandment hath nothing against it, there being an inferior Worship; which is far below Divine Service: but then *Protestant* Doctor

For teaches his *Footman* to aver, that *all Worship* (so he should have said to have spoken sense) is *Divine*, that the Text is plain against the Worship of any other but God. How likely is it they shall by their own judgment and reason understand the Bible, who cannot construe right, the Commandments, no, not the first of them! and if Dr. *Sherlock* and his *Footman* understand right the first Commandment, St. *Augustin* did not. Do you not blush Sir, to License the boldness of such ignorant Pride?

*Preservative*, f. 26. *Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image.* --- Is so express a Law against Image-Worship, that no reason must be admitted for it.

*Ans.* f. 6. What if you be told that the *Jews* may perhaps have had a Command of making no graven Image, &c. yet this being a positive Law, and not renewed in the Gospel, doth not oblige us: will this Reason be admitted? *No*, no reason; and yet you have no other reason for passing by as Express a Law of Sanctifying *Saturday*. What if it be rejoyn'd that only the making *to themselves* (by private Authority, making that to be which is not, a Statue for Example, which of its nature is the representation of a Man, or a Calf, to be to them a true God) an *Idol to adore it*, which divine Worship thus misapplied is forbidden. Cannot this Reason be heard? No, then *Belshazzar* by Gods direction and Command making several likenesses of things on Earth below, and in Heaven above; *Salomon* placing such in the Temple, sinned against the first Commandment (for the making of such is as distinctly forbidden as the *Adoring*; So if a Law thus says, *Thou shalt not carry any Arms, thou shalt not strike*: the carrying of Arms would be as directly against the Law as the striking) so do all Painters and Carvers, and all our *London Merchants* that hang out a Sign-post. The truth is, what sense they put on any Text, is the express Law against which no reason must be heard, so they challenge to themselves that infallibility which they so sturdily deny to the Church of God.

*Defence*, f. 13, 14. 'Tis held on all hands, that the keeping of the Seventh day was *Figurative*, and so abolished at the death of Christ; but as far as it was Moral, namely, that a



*Seventh Day should be kept*, that still remains. Besides, Christ and his Apostles were Authors of this change; Christ as he rose on that day, so he usually did appear on that day to his Disciples; and Scripture maintains the Celebration of it by the constant practice of the Apostles, *Acts* 20. 7. *1 Cor.* 16. 21.

*Ans.* We have four untruths in very few lines. The first, that 'tis agreed on all hands, that the keeping of the Seventh day was *Figurative*; all that understand Scripture right, say the contrary, to wit that it was not a meer Shadow of a thing to come (as *Figurative* speaks) but a Memory of the past and never to be forgotten benefit of the *Creation*, from the work whereof God rested on that day, and (says *Moses*) *blessed the seventh day*. 'Tis a second Untruth then, that the Moral part of it was only the keeping a *seventh day*, and that Christ our Lord altered it. 'Tis an untruth that Christ our Lord *usually* appeared on that day to his Apostles, for *Acts* 1. 3. *S. Luke* assures us he appeared every day to them: How *St. Pauls* meeting at *Troas* with many in the participation of the Sacraments, and disputing till Midnight, it being the Eve of his departure, or his *subscribing his Epistle with his own Hands*; (for these are the two Texts produced) is a Proof that the Scripture maintains the constant practice of the Apostles, of keeping *Sunday Holy*; I leave it to you Sir, to make out the truth of it.

*Defence, f. 14.* 'Tis sufficient (with Catholics) to submit to an infallible Guide, and that too if he declares as the Council of *Constance* did *Concerning the Eucharist*, that notwithstanding our Lord did *Institute it in both kinds*, and the Apostles so celebrated it, yet now it should not be so. But for us Protestants, we cannot think that any Reason can be sufficient to lay aside an Express Text.

*Ans.* The meaning of these words as they lay here, is to persuade the Readers, that the Council of *Constance* did own that Christ did *Institute or order*, that the Sacrament should be taken by all in both kinds, and that in the Apostles time it was ever so taken: yet that by the Church Authority it was ordered it should hereafter be otherwise: If the Honest *Footman* means not so, and would not have all to believe so, there

Per dies quadraginta apparet  
Eis. *Act.* 1. 3.  
*Act.* 2. 7.  
Salutatio mea  
manu Pauli  
*1 Cor.* 16. 21.



there is no sense at all in this his Inference, *That Protestants cannot think that any reason can be sufficient to lay aside an express Text.* But in this sense 'tis a most outrageous Calumny, and though a Footman's ignorance may be excused, yet with what face Sir, can you pretend to judge of Books and License them, if you are in the same gross Error; or if wilfully and wittingly you License such impudent Slanders, against the whole Churches Representative, what Libels, and Lampoons, are you not qualified and disposed to License? These are the words of the Council, *Although Christ did Institute this Venerable Sacrament after Supper, and did administer it to his Disciples under both the kinds of Bread and Wine; yet notwithstanding, the Authority of the Sacred Canons, the laudable and approved Custom of the Church hath observed, and observes, that this Sacrament ought not to be Consecrated after Supper, nor received by the Faithful not fasting, but in case of sickness, and such other necessity, as the Canon Law and the Church admit, or allow of.* And for this Custom, to avoid some dangers and scandals, hath been reasonably brought in; that, although this Sacrament in the Primitive Church was received by the Faithful under both kinds, since that it should be received by those who Consecrate (Priests) in both kinds, by the Laity only under the appearance of Bread. Because we are firmly to believe, and in no way to doubt, that the entire Body and Blood of Christ is truly contained as well under the species of Bread, as under that of Wine. Behold the Council declares, that it owns it no part of the Institution, that the Sacrament be taken under both kinds, no more than that it be taken at Night after Supper, &c. All these being but Circumstances belonging to that Discipline, which wholly depends on Church Authority, and is alterable at any time when there is reason for it. And indeed, if this be a Crime which Protestants cannot be capable of, how comes it to pass that your Congregations receive your Sacrament kneeling, fasting, in the Morning, in the Church, notwithstanding the Institution of Christ. Own Sir, own Candidly this insinuation to have been a Calumny.

*Preservative, f. 45. No Argument from the necessity of a thing, must be admitted to prove it is. (V. G. 'Tis proposed to You that) If there be no infallible Judge, there can be no cer-*

Decreta Concil  
Conf. Dec. 4.

Confici.

*tainty of Faith : though it be true, and you think it to be true, you must not allow this Consequence, therefore there is one; such Arguments do not prove that there be such a Judge, but that there Ought to be.*

*Ans. f. 6.* This is not only to mis-use human Reason, but to deny Wisdom and Reason in God. *Alphonſus* the Royal Mathematician, was ever look'd on as guilty of a horrid Blasphemy, for having said, That he thought he could have ordered some things better than God did at the first Creation : 'Tis one of as deep a die to think, that God ought to have done, what we believe he hath not done.

*Defence, f. 15.* The Doctor says, fol. 44. *We should never admit any Arguments merely from the usefulness, conveniency, or supposed necessity of any thing to prove it is.* Now the Answerer leaves out *supposed*, and so makes that *absolute* which was *conditional*.-----*If I thought* (says Dr. Sherlock) *all this were true, as I believe not a word of it is, (that if there be not an infallible Judge; there can be no certainty in Religion) I should only conclude, that it is great pity that there is not an infallible Judge Instituted by Christ.* But if you would have me conclude from these Premises. Ergo, there is an infallible Judge of Controversies, I must beg your pardon for that, for such Arguments as these do not prove that there is such a Judge, but only, that there ought to be one, and therefore I must Conclude no more from them. Indeed, this is a very fallacious way of Reasoning, because what we may call useful, convenient, necessary, may not be so it self: and we have reason to believe it is not so, if God have not appointed what we think so useful, convenient, and necessary, &c. And now I would fain know who it is that denies Wisdom and Reason in God.

*Ans.* It is a pleasant way of Answering in the Defence of a Person accused to have offended against the first Principles of Reason and Respect, to say that he hath spoken wisely, and dutifully elsewhere : yet so Answers our Footman, if it be an Answer, meerly to add what is not blamed in an Author, to what is blamed. Dr. Sherlock says well in advising us to believe that not to be necessary, which we know God hath not appointed, therefore I did not touch, or reflect on that saying: but I say that the advice he gives to one who  
*supposes*

*supposes there is a necessity of any thing towards the Eternal Salvation of Christians, That tho' he believe it true, yet he infers not, Sure then God hath bestowed it, Christ hath obtained it for us; but rather, God ought to have done it, Christ ought to have obtained it; but I do not therefore believe he hath.* This Advice, I say, is much more injurious to Gods Mercy and Wisdom, than the Saying so much blamed by all Christians in *Alphonsus*; the Salvation of Mankind being the ultimate Work of God towards his own Glory. Whether this Charge be not just, and Dr. *Sherlock* teach not this Doctrin in the words cited by the Answerer, in the Case of one who *supposes that there can be no certain Faith in a Christian,* (and such a Faith Christ exacts in all, by St. Paul and St. James, &c.) *without an infallible Guide, and who believes it to be true;* I leave it, Sir, to your observation.

### *Principles of Dr. Sherlock, which make void all Faith.*

Preserv. *S*uppose the Protestant Faith uncertain, how is the f. 79, 80. Cause of the Church of Rome the better? Is Thomas an honest Man because John is a Knave.

*Answer.* If Thomas and John be accused severally of a Theft, and the stoll'n Goods be found with John, I conceive, tho' this prove not Thomas so assuredly an honest Man, yet an honest Jury would bring him in *Not-guilty*. That there is a true Faith, and consequently a certain Rule of Faith, all Christians acknowledge, Protestants on one side choose one Rule, (how differently soever they apply it) Catholics another: I conceive then, that if the Protestant Rule be proved uncertain, 'tis plain the Catholic Rule must be the certain one.

*Defence f. 17.* You must first prove that 'tis impossible for People to make to themselves two wrong Rules.

*Answer.* I do not write against Dr. *Sherlock's* Errors, but with this Supposition, that he holds what generally is called (if there be any such fixed thing) the Doctrin of the Church  
Established

Established by the Law in *England*, I suppose he owns a Faith in *Christ*; That this Faith ought to be firm, certain, not wavering: for such is the Faith *S. Peter* and *S. Paul* require of us; That this Faith altogether leans on Revelation; That the Scriptures are the Word of God; That if we understood the full extent of its true Sense and Meaning, there would never be Error or Heresie amongst us: Hitherto we agree. Now the thing in question is, by what Method we ought to come to that Knowledge, as far as it is necessary to a Christian: and I say that all the Methods are reduced to these two Heads: That we are guided to the certain knowledge of what God hath revealed, either by a Knowledge communicated to each of us, or by a Knowledge communicated only to Guides appointed to direct the rest. If therefore *Protestants* are in the wrong, we are certainly in the right, as far as we are opposite to them. And besides, since that all the positive Proofs that can be brought for the infallible Authority of Church-Teachers express also in what Church they are, by evident Marks not to be found but in our *Catholic Church*, it follows, if the *Protestants* be in the wrong as to that Principle, we are certainly in the right as to each Point of our Religion, taught us by an unerring Interpreter.

*Preserv. f. 80.* This (that the *Protestant* Faith is uncertain) may signify two things. First, That the Objects of our Faith are uncertain, and cannot be proved by certain Reasons. Secondly, That our Persuasion is wavering.

*Ans. f. 7.* Besides the two mention'd, it signifies a Third thing also, to wit, That whatever Reasons there may be for a thing, he who believes it, hath not for the Motive of his Belief those certain Reasons. There are, for Example, certain Reasons, whereon to ground a Faith in *Jesus Christ*; yet he that believes in *Christ* merely because his Mother (or a Minister) hath taught him so to do, hath a very uncertain, and no Divine Faith.

*Defence f. 18.* What can be the Gentleman's meaning, I cannot conceive, unless it be this, That because *Protestants* take the Reason of their Faith from Scripture, and not from the Church of *Rome*, that therefore they can have no certain or Divine Faith: which if it be, I pity him; if it be not, I must desire him to explain himself.

*Answer.*

*Answer.* The honest Footman is grown very tender-hearted. But is not this very plain, that altho' there be very good Reasons for the belief of an Article of Christian Religion, yet one that should believe it on the account of some silly Motive only, such as I cited, would have no Divine Faith? But how can this be applied to *Protestants, who take the Reasons of their Faith from Scripture*? This I had shewed Fol. 6. but the Footman passes it by with this. Answer only, *I shall say nothing to that Harangue, so often Answered by our Divines.* It seems he had forgot those Answers, or was conscious of their weakness. Thus I discoursed there: The *Catholics* prove, that an *uncertain* or wavering Faith, is *no Divine Faith*, which the *Protestants* can never have of any one Article of their Religion, because they never can have a certain one. 'Tis easily proved, because they cannot have an act of Faith of any one Article, till their Rule of Faith proposes it, i. e. till they know certainly (by their private Reading and Judgment) what the Scriptures teach of it, not by some one Text or two, but by comparing all the Texts that treat of that Subject: for the Sense of a single Text (for Examp. *My Father is greater than I*) cannot be had, but by expounding it by other Texts on the same Subject. Till a *Protestant* then hath a certain knowledge, *First*, that he hath all the Books of Holy Writ; *Secondly*, that all those he owns for such, were really written by inspired Pens; *Thirdly*, that he hath a true and sound Translation (in case he understood not the Original Languages) and (in case he doth) a true Copy not altered by the Error or Malice of our Forefathers; *Fourthly*, (since the Letter kills) that he understands the true Meaning and Sense of each Text, which relates to the Object of his Act of Faith? *Fifthly*, that he remember them all, so as comparing them, to see which be the *clearer* that must expound the *obscurer*, and what is the *true result* of them all, (for any one which he understands not, or hath forgotten, may possibly be that one that must expound the rest) he cannot have *one* Act of Faith. Now *Catholics* say, this is impossible to most, if not to all *Protestants*, (who are in each of these Points to Judge for themselves, and not to submit to any Authority where a Doubt arises) therefore *few*, or *no Protestants* can in their whole Life-time frame one Act of Di-  
vine

*vine Faith* concerning any *one Mystery*, not that Scripture is not a very certain Rule, but because they have chosen an useless (because impossible) and *uncertain* way of applying it.

*Preservat. ib.* We believe the Apostles Creed, and whatever is contained in the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles. This is all we believe, and I hope they will not say these things are uncertain.

*Answer.* They are very certain, but not to any *Protestant*, whose Rule of Faith (considering the Method he applies it by) cannot make him certain of any one Article. But the pleasant Answer which Justifies *Turk, Jew and Gentile*: For this is a Rule of Faith most sufficient, according to Dr. *Sherlock*, (and a good Plea) *We believe all that God hath revealed, and nothing else, is not all that he hath revealed certain?* Here lies the Doctor's gross Mistake, that no one is an *Heretic* for not believing that what God hath revealed is true, 'tis impossible to fall into so mad an Heresie: But *Heretics* are such, for not believing him to have revealed what in effect he hath, tho' he hath given sufficient Methods to come to the knowledge of it, if they would use them.

*Defence.* Do *Jews, Turks and Gentiles* believe all that is contained in the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles?

*Answer.* No, Sir, nor you neither. If they believed all that God hath revealed, (as they pretend) they would believe all that is delivered in the Bible, which you pretend, but upon as little ground: What they think in their Judgment God hath revealed, they believe; what they think he hath not revealed, they disbelieve: that's their Rule of Faith, and 'tis yours, your own private Judgments being on both hands your Guides, and not any Authority Established by Almighty God.

*Preservat. f. 81.* If these things (which are believed by those who take their Faith from the Bible interpreted by their own final Sense) be not built upon certain Reasons, their Infallible Church can have no certainty of the Christian Faith.

*Answer.* Even this is most notoriously false, since she is not Infallible by any Light of her own, but by the Guidance of the Spirit of Truth. Were not the Apostles, when they had once acknowledged *Christ* to be the Son of God, certain

of



of all he revealed to them, before he had given them *certain Reasons* for it? It were a blind Impiety to think so.

*Defence f. 19.* Was there (in that Case of the Apostles) a certain Faith without a certain Reason. An infallible Man must know things as they are, or else he is mistaken.

*Answer.* The *Footman* is very dull here, and cannot distinguish between a certain Reason moving me to believe him that speaks, and a certain Reason in the things that are delivered moving me to believe them. This Second Dr. *Sherlock* requires, saying, That if these things which are believed, be not built upon certain Reasons, the Infallible (Church seeing not any such Reasons) can have no certainty of the Christian Faith. An infallible Person must know what he knows as it truly is, but needs not see how or why it can be so.

*Preservat. f. 82.* 'Tis their common Argument, That there is a great variety among Protestants, and that they condemn one another with equal confidence and assurance.

*Answer.* 'Tis one of your usual Artifices, to leave out always the pressing part of our Arguments: you should have added, *Tho' they use the same Rule of Faith, and apply it by the same Method.* Thus proposed, 'tis an unanswerable Argument against your Rule of Faith, and evidently proves it uncertain.

*Defence f. 19, 20.* Here the honest *Footman* sends me for an Answer to Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and bids me try my Skill upon him. Thus he delivers the Answer given to J. S. first Letter, and applied to the present Case; 'tis divided into five Propositions, which, to avoid repeating, I'll set down with the following Answer.

*Answer.* First, *Arithmetick* (says Dr. *Stillingfleet*) prescribes a certain way by Addition and Subtraction, to find out any Sum. 'Tis granted. Secondly, Therefore it must be such, that they who take it, shall arrive by it at the exact Sum. That's true also. Thirdly, But two Men, who have made use of the same way, differ at least a Hundred in casting up the Sum. This is impossible, if they both really made use of that way as the words of Dr. *Stillingfleet* express: But 'tis very possible, if the meaning be, one of them doth not know the Rules of *Arithmetick*, but only thinks he knows them; or both know well the Rule, but one blundered, and set down one Figure for another.

F

Fourthly,

Fourthly, *Therefore they who take only that way, cannot by it arrive at the certain Sum.* This is evidently false, and the contrary true; to wit, *Therefore they who take precisely that way, (and not another for it, erring in the Theory or the Practice) cannot but arrive by it at the certain Sum.* But this following Conclusion might have been drawn from the Third Proposition taken in its Second most improper Sense, which Dr. Stillingfleet gives to it, *Therefore those who err in the Knowledge, or miss in the Application of the Rule of Arithmetick, tho' they believe never so much in their own Judgment that they know and use the Rule right, tho' they have used their best Endeavors, tho' they firmly believe they have cast the Sum right, yet certainly they have missed, and are in the wrong.* This is the Conclusion which the Dean of Pauls should have drawn, and then he might have concluded, *Still the Rule is certain to those who use it right.* But is this the Reverend Dr. Stillingfleet's full Answer, and that in Dr. Sherlock's Case? Stupidity it self would not own it: 'Tis an evident Demonstration against Dr. Sherlock's Position, and Dr. Stillingfleet's Tenet. It proves evidently, that altho' Scripture be as infallible a Truth, and thereby a Rule of Truth, (for from Truth only Truth can follow) as any Rule of Arithmetick; yet as in one Case, if two casting up an Account by the same pretended Rule, differ in the total Sum, this following Principle would not only be false, but also after such a trial most absurd and senseless. Every one is bound in reason to believe the Account he hath cast up, to be right, if he hath a Book of Arithmetick by him, hath read it, believes he understands it, and hath used his best Endeavors to follow it. So is this like Principle, which Dr. Sherlock and all his Party stand for: *If two Men have the Bible, read it, endeavor to understand it, and believing they do, draw from the same Scriptures two different Conclusions, two opposite Articles of Faith, both are bound to stand to their private Judgment, and to believe themselves in the right, tho' all the World should accuse one or both of them in lieu of the true pretended Rule, to have used a false one.* But let us suppose farther, that an eminent Master of Arithmetick should shew to one of these Men where he erred against the true Rule of that Science, where he misplaced a cypher, otherwise than the Rule directs; that this Man in lieu of submitting, should appeal to his Book

Ex vero non  
nisi verum.

of Arithmetick, by the which also the other teaches, and the Dispute should be carried on by the one saying the Book teaches and directs thus, whilst the other as sturdily pretended it teaches and directs otherwise. In this Case were it a reasonable Principle, *Both must stand to their private Judgment in Interpreting of the Book, and well they may, for the Rule is certain, which both follow.* Never did Man give a fairer and easier Victory to an Adversary, than Dr. *Stillingsfleet* doth to his, by this *Simile*. The dullest School-Boy will easily discern the Dean of *Paul's* patent *Paralogism*, whereby he compares the *written Word* of God to the Rule it self of Arithmetick; whereas the natural and only true Comparison is, of the *Book or Letter of Scripture* with the Book of Arithmetick; the true Sense of Scripture with the Rule of Arithmetick.

A Right-Line-Rule and a Square are the Rule of a Carpenter; suppose a Carpenter had a bent and crooked Rule, and that what he calls his Square opened at an acute or obtuse Angle; this Man working by these, would certainly make his Work wrong. I ask you now where the Fault would be? Certainly in his Rule, in his (supposed) Square and Rule. But is not a Carpenter's Rule exact? Yes, a Carpenter's, but not this Carpenter's; the Rule he pretends to follow is most just, the Rule which he actually follows is most false and erroneous: And if many Carpenters pretending to work by a Right-Line and Square, applying them the same way, did all differ in the Irregularity of their Work, it would be evident they had a false Rule; for that's ones Rule, not that he pretends to have, but what he actually works by. Now to apply this to our Case: The Word of God is not the Letter, but the true Sense of the Bible; for the knowledge of Scripture, as St. *Hierom* observes, *consists not in the Reading, but the Understanding of it.* The Rule of Faith then, is the Sense of the Letter of Scripture; The pretended Rule is the true Sense of Scripture; The real Rule that Christians use, is that Sense of the Letter of Scripture by which they square their Faith: for that is any ones real Rule, by which he in reality acts. The true Sense of Scripture is a certain Rule; The Sense given to the Letter of Scripture is a most uncertain, and frequently a wrong Rule; The Rule Protestants pretend unto, is a certain infallible Rule, for Truth never misguides:

Scripture non  
in legendo sed  
intelligendo  
constitunt.

But *their Rule* of Faith is the Sense which each Man's private Judgment gives to the Letter of Scripture; for they square their Faith by it, & believe according to the same: The Letter of Scripture is their Material Rule, as a piece of Wood is the Material Square of a Carpenter; their *application of Sense to this Letter* is that which makes their real and Formal Rule, as the streightness or crookedness of a Rule, is the *true Rule* of the Carpenter that uses it. 'Tis against this I write, and against Dr. *Sherlock's Principle*, that tho' several Men using the same Method of making Rules, find and own that their several Rules make different Lines; yet it follows not (says he) that the Rules they work by are not *true*, nor their Methods of making themselves a Rule, erroneous.

Prefervat. f. 83, 84. *Were all Protestants of a mind, would their Consent and Agreement prove the certainty of their Faith?*

*Answer* f. 7. Not at all; but 'tis a most ridiculous Inference of yours, *This is the same Rule, and their Disagreement proves not their uncertainty.* All Union is not an Argument of the Spirit of God, for People may combine to do ill; But St. Paul assures us, *Disunion and Dissension* is a certain Mark of the absence of the Spirit of God.

*Defence* f. 21. You should have added in some, not in all the disagreeing Parties. If the Question be put amongst a company of Men to go rob such a House, is it a Mark of the absence of the Spirit of God in those which do not agree to that Wickedness.

*Answer.* Certainly this honest Footman is hired to write as wide as may be from Reason, that in Comparison with it Dr. *Sherlock's Errors* may appear tolerable. I speak of People led into Disunion by the *same Principle*, which from thence I conclude to be no good one: And I pray, those who refuse to go and rob the House, do they act in this Refusal by the same Principle by which others are moved to the Robbery? If they be, (for Example, out of Spite) tho' their Refusal be just and good, their Motive or Rule they act by (and of that only I speak) is stark naught.

*Dr. Sherlock's*

## Dr. Sherlock's Principle, which makes void all Scripture-proof.

Preservative, **I** F a Mystery appears against Sense and Reason, fol. 72. we must have a Scripture proof as cannot possibly signify any thing else; or else it will not answer that Evidence which we have against it, Sense and Reason proving it naturally impossible.

*Answ. f. 7.* A Text which cannot possibly have an other sense doth not leave it in any ones liberty who owns Scripture to be an *Heretic*, therefore the Church produced no such Texts against the *Arians* or *Nestorians* ( to whom the Mysteries of the Trinity, and of Christs Human and Divine Nature in one Person, appeared against Sense and Reason ) whence it evidently follows, that according to Dr. *Sherlock* the *Arians* and *Nestorians*, were bound not to believe the Trinity, and Incarnation of Christ. A happy Ministerial Guide, and well led such as follow him.

*Defence, f. 22.* The Trinity and Incarnation, which the *Arians* and *Nestorians* disputed, they are Mysteries indeed, and might seem to be above Sense and Reason, but they are not contrary to it. But that Transubstantiation contradicts both, is plain.

*Answ.* The Footman had better have minded his Masters business, than to pretend an Answer, to what he doth not as much as understand. Certainly the Mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, are not against Sense and Reason, but they did appear so to the *Nestorians*, and *Arians*, and that is the Case, put by Dr. *Sherlock*: and therefore 'tis evident, that according to his Principle, *Arians* and *Nestorians* were bound not to leave their Heresies.

Dr. Sherlock's

## Dr. Sherlock's Principle, making void all use of Councils and Fathers.

*Preservative,* **A**fter he hath respectively told us, *That* fol. 73 *Learned men may squabble about the Fathers;* he gives these Rules without which they be of no use.  
1. We must know that the Father is truly Author of the Book (or the Council of such a Decree.) 2. That he was not corrupted by the ignorance or knavery of the Transcribers, while they were in the hands of the Monks (and to make this impossible he assures us) They not only pared their Nails, but also their very Habits and Dress, to fit them to the Modes of the time. 3. That the Father doth not in some other place Contradict what there he says. 4. That he did not alter his Opinion after. That's to say, some of these requisites, not being possibly to be known, no use is to be made of them.

*Answer E. 2.*

*Defence, f. 23, 24.* These requisites, that man that will build any thing upon their Authority must know, or else he may be miserably mistaken, yet this is not to deny any use of Fathers and Councils, for Learned men may dispute about them.

*Answer.* A rare Privilege granted to Learned Men, that they may dispute about Fathers, and Councils, but not till they have resolved some doubts first, which cannot possibly be resolved. This is to sport pretty pleasantly, but not to answer.

## Dr. Sherlock's Principle, which makes void all use of Civil Charity, and Mo- ral Justice to our Neighbor.

*Answer.* **I**T lies in his last Chapter, in which he attempts fol. 8. in vain to colour the Misrepresentations which his Party hath ever been guilty of. It



It is when a mans Exterior Actions are naturally capable of a good and pious meaning, and he ever and clearly declares that it is *His*. Yet to fasten upon him another opposite design and meaning, taken from his opposers contrary Principle. Than which there cannot be a greater and more unjust *dissimulatio*, this he calls to *join Protestant Principles with Popish Practices*. For Example, to insinuate, *That a Catholick thinks the blessed Virgin more Powerful in Heaven than Christ*; He tells us, that he says ten *Ave Maria's* for one *Lords Prayer*. And this though he knows, that the first half of the *Ave Mary* is in memory of, and thanksgiving for the Incarnation of Christ, and the other half asks of the Virgin, *only to pray for us* to Christ, which is all the Power we allow her in Heaven.

*Defence, p. 24.* The matter of Fact is true. — Suppose he doth not think her more powerful than Christ, yet sure he must think her more merciful, and ready to hear his Prayers.

*Ans.* This is in lieu of excusing his Masters Malice and dissimulatio, meerly to make the Proverb Good, *like Master, like Man*. *Mary* her self, her Merciful concern for us, her Prayers are an Effect and Gift of the Mercy of Christ. But to see how people will speak in spight of Sense, when they are resolved to impugn Truth: how can it prove that I believe a person more merciful than another, because I repeat oftner my instances and Petition. Naturally we call that a greater mercy which is sooner moved, and yields to a single address. But the whole is a most false Calumny, as it insinuates that our Church applies her Devotions more to our blessed Lady than to Christ. Our *Mass*, our *Church Office*, (except now and then a short Prayer of three or four lines) our Meditations, our Fasts, are all directed to God and Christ, from him only we expect the whole Mercy that must blot out our Sins, and the whole Goodness that must make us Eternally happy.

*Preservative, f. 89.* The *Papist* believes it unlawful to commit Idolatry, and most damnable to Worship any Breatden God, which is spoke like a *Protestant*, but yet he pays Divine Adoration to the *Sacrament*, which is done like a *Papist*.

*Ans.*

*Ans. f. 8.* This I call the most disingenuous Representation, and the most false Calumny imaginable, as a supposed and owned Truth; to wit, *That Catholics Worship the visible Species in the Eucharist.* A most impudent slander, no Catholic being guilty of it, no more than the Apostles of Worshipping and Adoring the Cloths of Christ, when they Adored him upon Earth.

*Defence, f. 21.* There is no mention made of Species, but the word is Sacrament.

*Ans.* This is what I called disingenuity. If he takes not Sacrament in the Catholic sense, therein lies his fraud, in Expounding by his opposite Principles, our Actions: and in the Catholic sense nothing hath a reference to his Accusation of a *Breaden God*, but the visible Species of Bread.

I concluded with this address to *Protestants*, in Dr. *Sherlock's* words, putting (as I owned) the word *Scripture* in the lieu of *Fathers*, to shew that according to his very way of Reasoning, the meer reading of Scripture, could not serve for an useful Guide at least to the far greatest part of *Protestants*. The Sentence is, as follows.

*Preservative, f. 76.* Amongst Christians there is not one in a hundred thousand who understands all Scripture, and it is morally impossible they should, and therefore there must be certainly an easier and shorter way to understand Christian Religion, than this, or else the generality of mankind, even of profess'd Christians, are out of possibility of Salvation. Think well on it, as you will answer at Gods Tribunal for the care you took of the one only necessary, the saving of your Souls, seek out that easier and shorter way, and walk faithfully in it.

*Defence, f. 26, 27.* We do not only say, but we find, that Scripture in all points necessary to Salvation, is plain and easie, so that we may run and read. 'Tis true, there are some Texts which we that are unlearned, cannot readily find the true sense and meaning of, but they are not such as immediatly concern Salvation; and we are not destitute of helps as to these, for we have learned and Religious Divines.

*Ans.* Is it not pleasant to say, that Scripture is plain and easie in all points necessary to Salvation: and yet to see that those

those who use the same Method for the understanding of it, differ as much as may be in the belief of these Points? Is it not against plain Scripture, to say, that such Texts as the *unlearned* cannot readily find the sense of, are not such as immediately concern Salvation, whereas Scripture teaches us, that there be Texts *which the unlearned wrest to their own perdition*. Well, I am weary in following this *Footman*, running Extravagantly out of all Way, and Reason. Neither, Sir, have I any mind to add to this long Letter, any farther Advice adress'd to your self: If the exposing to your Eyes the Characters of the Books you License, doth not move you not to prostitute so easily your Name to those heaps of disingenuous Cavils, ill-tail'd Calumnies, and monstrous Misrepresentations, which you daily License; it shall be to me a sufficient Note and Character of a Book not worth the reading, much less the Censuring, where ever I see you have opened it the Press, which will in part ease of an ungrateful and unnecessary toil.

S I R,

*Your Servant to all*

*Christian Offices,*

LEWIS SABRAN,

*Of the Society of JESUS.*

---



---

## P O S T S C R I P T.

**T**H O' the *Preface* to Dr. *Sherlock's Defence* might very naturally have challenged to be first Answered; yet because the *Defence* did attempt (tho' most vainly) to undermine the very Foundation of the Christian Faith, that *Rock* of the *Catholic Church*, on which *Christ* our Blessed Lord raised it; whereas the *Preface* was stuffed chiefly with forged Calumnies against me, I thought it my Duty (and ever shall) to pass by my own private Concerns, till I had vindicated the Church of God. Now, Sir, I come to my own Defence.

I find my Adversaries Choler heated to the highest Ferment, because I Answered the *Celebrated Preservative*, an excellent Tract, says he, proved so acceptable by the *Universal Entertainment* it met with, in a single Sheet, which he says was a ridiculous Answer to so great a Book. I omitted nothing, Sir, that even pretended to the appearance of an Argument; and if your *Celebrated Books* swell so with words, and prove void of Sense and Reason, am I blameable for it? He should have pointed at some pretended Proofs which I slighted to expose, or have praised me for not wearying my Readers with a dull Prolivity: But it seems we must copy these Men's Faults, or abide their Censure.

He tells us next, That the *Accusations of Forgery, of Clipping of Texts, Fathers and Councils*, Run high on both sides; That the Reader hath this certain way of knowing where the Guilt lies; That the Church of Rome accuses us, but do's not prove it; but our Men do not only accuse them, but prove it upon them. This is indeed somewhat material, and he instances upon my *Forgeries* on the one side, and those that Dr. Comber, Author of the *Advice to Roman Catholics*, is accused of on the other. I am content to joyn issue upon this matter; and having produced the Grounds on which these several Accusations are  
bottom'd

bottom'd, I will leave the Decision to your and every unbiass'd Reader's Judgment, having first own'd *Forgery* to be the greatest Mark of a bad Cause, and that even own'd such by those who thus defend it. He produces against me three Letters, written, as he says, *by one of their Learned Writers*; in which no less than One and twenty such Forgeries are prov'd upon me, and *Protestant*-like, because I am *accus'd*, concludes me *guilty*, without taking the least notice of my full Answers given to those most false Calumnies; he and his *Learned Author* following both the old Advice, *Calumniare fortiter, aliquid adhaerebit*; Do but Calumniate boldly, something will stick of the Dirt you cast. First then, I will shew the confident Impudence of my Accuser.

I Preach'd on the 23<sup>th</sup> of *August* last before his Sacred Majesty at *Chester*, on the Conversion of St. *Augustin* from Heresie and a loose Life; and throughout that Sermon I laid out in the B. Saint's own words, those mistaken Reasons that hindred him, and keep off present *Seſſaries* from a due Reconciliation with the Catholic Church: I offer'd evident Motives taken from the same Saint's words, which oblig'd Him, and do as efficaciously exact from all *Protestants*, under pain of Eternal Damnation, (when a most dull Ignorance doth not excuse them) to return to the Communion of that *one only Church*, which they profess'd themselves Members of at their *Baptism*. Those unanswerable Arguments of so great a Doctor mov'd many, to my knowledge, to a happy Imitation of so Learned a Saint; but they were too plain and solid to meet with even a seeming Answer from the boldest of their Mercenary Pens.

The only Trick left them, was by some sly Insinuation, some Calumny, to divert the well-meaning Reader's Attention: and a Minister, better known by his *Forehead* than *Wit*, attempted it boldly in a *Postscript*. He was however afraid of burning his Fingers with touching the Sermon it self, but nibbled at three Lines of the Introduction to it, a *Form of Prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mother of our Lord*, taken out of the *Thirty fifth Sermon* of S. *Augustin de Sanctis*: Then to support himself with big words, he accuses me of *Forgery* and *Disingenuity*, not for citing any thing otherwise than it lay in that

Sermon, but because, forsooth, this is not really St. *Augustin's* Sermon, but a *Spurious Piece* unjustly Fathered upon him: Then he as insolently triumphs, as a weak Enemy, who not daring to attack a Camp, should brag of the Victory, because he had most courageously shot at random at an exposed Centinel. Now, Sir, take a view of his Proofs, and of those Forgeries he accuses me of in the two Letters, which I writ in my own Defence. His Proofs were these.

First the Title, *A Sermon on the Feast of the Assumption* doth not agree at all to any thing that is near *S. Augustin's* time. There was then not only no Feast of the Assumption (therefore no Sermon could then be Preached on that Solemnity) but not even any belief of such an Assumption.

This is a most weak pretence of a Proof: For, as I shewed, that *Day of Assumption*, when applied to any deceased Saint, ever signified in the Language of Fathers, the *Day of their Death*. I cited several Sermons made by the Fathers, as *S. Cyril, Amphilochius, Methodius*, made on our Lady's Purification, long before any Solemnity of it were observed in the Church of God: That *S. Hierom*, or an Author of the same Age, *William of Paris, S. Bernard*, made Orations on the Assumption of our Blessed Lady, altho' they doubted of her being assumed into Heaven in Body: That the Sermon in *S. Meliton's* name, own'd for his in the Fifth Century, spake as fully on the real Assumption of our Blessed Lady, as any Catholic ever did since. And therefore it is evidently false, that there was no such Belief in *S. Augustin's* time. Farther I added, That, as *Nicephorus* witnesses, *Jacquel* Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, proved the truth of this Mystery as now piously believed in the Catholic Church, to have been received of very ancient Tradition, and that in the presence of *Marcion* the Emperor, in whose time was the Fourth General Council. Next I shew'd what a Cheat this Minister put upon his Readers, by insinuating that the *Thirty fifth Sermon* I cited, spake not of the Blessed Virgins Death, but of her Assumption in the Sense which that word now vulgarly bears; whereas the contrary is most evident, and is expressed in such words as are found in all the ancient Writings of the Fathers on this Subject; to wit, *In these the World is honor'd by so great a Virgins departure; in what order*



order or manner she passed hence to Heaven, the Catholic Church doth no way recount, neither is her Body found on Earth, neither is her Assumption in the Flesh (as it is read in the Apocrypha's) found in the Catholic Church. This is the true Opinion concerning her Assumption, that not knowing whether in her Body or out of it, (as the Apostle hath it) we believe her assumed above the Angels. Is it not evident from hence, that this Minister most falsely imposed upon his Readers? To this Accusation of mine he returns not a word of Answer; to my Proofs, only these insignificant Trifles, That *Nicephorus* comes too late; That *S. Bernard* doubted of our Blessed Lady's Assumption in Body; That the first mention we find of *Melion's* Book was Sixty Years after *S. Augustin's* time, when it was declared Apocryphal: Not a word to the Sermon under *S. Hieron's* name, nor to any of my other Proofs.

His Second Proof was, That very lately some *Benedictin's* at *Paris*, in their late Edition of *S. Augustin's* Works, had cast it into their Appendix as *Spurious*; and that they told us, that in their MSS. it wanted the Name of any Author; but that the *Louvain* Doctors told us, that in several Manuscripts which they used in their Edition of *S. Augustin* this Sermon de *Sanctis* was intitled to *Fulbertus Carnotensis*.

1. I Answered, That these were no Proofs, or where they have an appearance of a Proof, that 'tis grounded on a Mistake. 'Tis no Proof at all on any side, that in many Manuscripts there was no Name to the Sermon; this is self-evident. 2. That it is evident this Sermon was not of *Fulbertus Carnotensis*; for the Sermon I cited assures us, that the Church at that time taught nothing of the Corporal Assumption of the Virgin; whereas *Fulbertus* in his Sermon of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, teaches, That *Christian* Piety believed, that *Christ* raised gloriously his Mother, and placed her above the Heavens. This was an undeniable Proof, and therefore the Minister answers nothing to it: However, I added out of Courtesie, that 'tis no new thing that a Saint's Sermon should in some Manuscripts appear under other Names than their known Authors, the same having happened to several Sermons of *S. Chrysologus*, *S. Ambrose*, &c. That *Synclerica's* Life, the undoubted Work of *S. Athanasius*, was in some ancient Manuscripts intitled to *Poly-*  
carp

*carp the Anchoret.* The Minister disproves not any one of these Instances. To his vain Argument, that the Style of this Sermon did seem to differ from that of *S. Augustin's*, (which is his private Opinion, and of few late Writers) I opposed the contrary Opinion of *S. Thomas Aquinas*, who owned this Sermon to be *S. Augustin's*; that eminent Doctor, so well versed in this Saint's Writings, that he was called *Augustinus Contrarius*: a Doctor, to the defence of whose Doctrine, the greatest part of Christian Divines are sworn. Was not this a very full Answer? Yet to shew how the *Louvain* Doctors owned the *Invocation of Saints* to have been *S. Augustin's* Doctrine, I minded him, that they receive his *Eighteenth* Sermon de *Sanctis*, in which he speaks thus, *Having received these our Vows by thy Prayers, obtain Pardon for our Sins.——What we offer, let it by thee be pardonable. What we ask with a faithful Mind, let it become attainable; Receive what we offer, return us what we ask, &c.*

The Last Proof the Minister offers, and which he values most, is, That one *Isidore* is quoted in that *Twenty fifth* Sermon de *Sanctis* thus: *Hence Isidore observes it is uncertain by this Saying, whether the Sword of the Spirit is meant, or the Sword of Persecution.* Now *Isidore of Sevil* in his Book of the Life and Death of Saints, Chap. 68. hath these words: *Which indeed is uncertain, whether he meant the Sword of Martyrdom, or the Word of God, heavy and sharp beyond any double-edged Sword.* 'Tis evident, says the Minister, this same *Isidore* is cited in the *Thirty fifth* Sermon, which could not therefore be of *S. Augustin's* composing, who lived Two hundred years before this *Isidore*.

This indeed hath the face of a Proof; therefore I offered these following Reasons, why the *Isidore* quoted in the *Thirty fifth* Sermon, was not the *Isidore of Sevil*. 1. In the *Thirty fifth* Sermon in debate, are these words: *In our time no Author among the Latins can be found, who treating of the Blessed Virgins Death, hath been positive and express.* Now *S. Gregory of Tours*, being one of the most famous Authors of the Sixth Age, and having as fully and positively written of this *Assumption* as any since, the Author assuring, that no one amongst the *Latins* had done so, could not be a Learned Bishop that lived

lived after the Seventh Century; and therefore the *Isidore* whom he cites, cannot possibly be *Isidore of Sevil*. Again, the Sermon cited under the name of *S. Hieron*, and at least as ancient as the Fourth General Council, and which was cited by the famous *Hincmar* Bishop of *Rheims*, by *S. Odilo*, and others contemporaries with *Fulbertus*, could not have escaped his knowledge. As for the words of *Isidore of Sevil*, they vary as much from those that are cited in the *Thirty fifth* Sermon, as the words which express the same sense in *Epiphanius*, who writ before *S. Augustin*. Hence I infer'd, that since we know many *Isidores*, and famous before *S. Augustin's* time, 'tis far more probable, that one of these was cited in the *Thirty fifth* Sermon, and therefore without any danger of *Forgery*, I might well cite a Sermon as *S. Augustin's*, (especially in a meer Introduction to a Sermon) which the greatest Divine of the latter Ages, and whom most do follow in this, had cited, and that as a Proof in Arguing. All that is replied to this is, That the Author of the *Thirty fifth* Sermon looked upon *S. Gregory* as mistaken. But can that allow him to say, that no body writ *Positively on that Subject*, meaning only that they were mistaken? This is the Issue of that Controversie which this *Preface-maker* styles me *Famous for*: I leave it to your Judgment; Sir, whether my Defence doth not prove it a *Calumny* in the Minister who accused me, in citing this Sermon, of *Disingenuous Forgery*. He knew well his weak Surmises, misplaced by him for Arguments, could not make it out: therefore having espied in my Second Letter, that I resolved to take no farther notice of such unknown *Masks* or *Persons* who concealed their Names, that their Errors when baffled, their *Calumnies* when cleared, may not put them to the Blush, he confidently puts out a Third Letter, without any the least addition of a new Proof, and again conceals his Name, to secure himself from an Answer, which he knew I had publicly professed I would not give, if he thus concealed his Name, and only repeated what I had Answered; then he most *disingenuously* brags that I had dropt the Question. Now, Sir, a full account of the Controversie being thus given, observe the vain silliness of the *Preface-maker's* accusing me of *Forgery*.

1. *The 35th Sermon of S. Augustin, a Forgery.*

2. *The 14th Sermon de Sanctis, a Forgery.*

3. *The 18th Sermon of S. Augustin de Sanctis, a Forgery.*

*S. Hierom's Sermon a Forgery.*

*S. Meliton's Book a Forgery.*

I have now proved how false this Charge is.

'Tis owned at all hands for *S. Augustin's*, not disproved or denied by my very Adversary in his last Answer, who only complains that the Citation in the Margin did not lead him to it.

My very adversary owns, that the *Louvain Divines* Printed it amongst those Works of *S. Augustin*, which they own for his, but not with an *undeni'd* Certainty.

I expressly cited it as a Sermon that went under *S. Hierom's* Name, and therefore added, *Or an Author of the same Age*. Not a word hath been attempted to prove there was not such a Sermon in that Age. Pray where lies the Forgery?

My words were, *A Sermon under S. Meliton's Name*. 'Tis evident there was such an one by the very Censure of *Pelagius* in a Council above 1200 Years ago, when it was reckoned amongst the *Apocrypha*, that is, of an Authority doubted of, and not asserted to its Author. Wherein lies this Forgery? But in one of my Letters it was Printed *Melion* for *Meliton*, tho' corrected in the next. These Men are as wonderful Persecutors of *Errata's*, as *Dr. Tenison* of *Errors in Spelling*: But such Trifles must be the Pagantry of these great Writers Atchievements; and those, it seems, who at the end of their Books note the *Errata's* of the Print, own them.

*The Story about Juvenal and Marcion, a Forgery.*

*S. Athanasius de Incarnatione, a Forgery.*

*A Prayer to the Virgin, not a syllable whereof was to be found there, a Forgery.*

*S. Cyril's Quotation falsified, a Forgery.*

*Nectarius upon Theodore, a Forgery.*

*That the Prayers out of Methodius, Ephrem Syrus, Athanasius, S. Leo, are Forgeries.*

themselves guilty of great *Forgeries*.

And why? *Nicephorus*, who writ it, lived almost a thousand years after *S. Augustin*, and was the first Historian found to have mentioned it. Doth not this prove me guilty of a great *Forgery* in citing *Nicephorus*?

What Proof for it? Every man indeed hath owned it to be his Work; but the last Critick, one *du Pin*, hath lately questioned it, therefore a *Forgery*. Is not this a shameless Nonsense? *Luther* did not own *S. James's* Epistle Canonical, therefore 'tis a *Forgery*, is as good an Inference.

I cited to him the Leaf in his own Century-Writers, where the Place and Leaf in *Athanasius's* his Works are cited, to be found where the *Centuriators* quote them; yet this must be a *Forgery*.

I proved evidently in my first Letter to you, Sir, that the Minister had egregiously falsified it, and that I had it right according to all the *Greek* and *Latin* Copies.

In the same Letter I have convinced the Minister of his dull Ignorance, and taught him where to find that Sermon of *Nectarius*, but no Answer given me, no notice taken of mine, yet it must be a *Forgery*.

I cited not one of these, but told my Minister, I could cite from those Authors, if need were, evident Instances of Praying to Saints. He, very wisely, not so much as

H

knowing

knowing what and whence I would cite, declares they must needs be *Forgeries*; this *Preface-maker* adds confidently, that certainly they are so. Is not this a bold kind of Calumny?

*S. Gregory Nazianzen's Prayer to the Blessed Virgin, a Forgery.*

*The Proof from S. Ambrose is a Forgery.*

No Proof of this but the Minister's plain Assertion against the general Sense of the Learned World. Is not this a pleasant way of proving upon us *Forgeries*.

How is this proved? *I do not find* (says the Minister) *the Title of this Sermon in the INDEX, and I will not turn over five Tomes.* To ease him of the labor, I tell him 'tis the 14th Sermon, pag. 144. in the Fifth Tome of the *Paris* Edition of 1661. What Answer is returned me? None, but *No matter*, says this *Preface-maker*. It was called a *Forgery* by the Minister, it must be still a *Forgery*.

*The Proof from S. Gregory Nazianzen's Jamicks, is a Forgery.*

Boldly said: is it proved? Not one single word by either of the Ministers; but as a Ministers Oath lately made any Loyal Man a Traitor, so this Minister's bare saying it is, must make any of the Fathers Works a *Forgery*.

*The Council of Chalcedon was chips and shreds, the Councils of Laodicea, Gangræ and Carthage, misrepresented.*

In my First Letter to you, Sir, I have cleared evidently these three Calumnies. The Case of the Council of Carthage is, whether these words in all the Greek Originals,

*O martyr pro nobis*, and all the Latin Translations, *Martyr orat pro nobis*, ought to be translated: *That the Martyr pray for us*, or as the Minister rendred it, *The Martyr will intercede to you for us*. This Second,



cond, I said, and say still, was a *Forgery*; and whoever can but Construe *Greek* and *Latin*, will, I am sure, say that I translated right, and that the Minister was guilty of *Forgery*. I proved the Sense I gave to a Canon of the Council of *Laodicea* to be the true one from *Theodoret*; That of the Council of *Gangra* from the very *Synodical* Epistle of that Council; That of *Carthage* was so evident, that the Minister having nothing to offer against it, thought fit only to say, without attempting the least Proof, *All this is nothing to the purpose*: yet the *Preface-maker* will have them all *Forgeries*.

Had not this Minister great reason to conclude in his Preface, *He was amaz'd at such a Mass of Forgeries in so little room*. These Gentlemen forget the Axiom, *Probationes habere debent Lib. qui accus' qui accusare volunt*; They must have Proofs at hand that will *face c. de censur. accuse*. I have, I conceive, fully made out in my Vindication, that *Protestant* Ministers do accuse our Writers of *Forgery*, but prove it not, and therefore stand guilty of the basest sort of *Calumny*, which hath as much of *Silliness* as of *Dishonesty*. Now I would make out the other Truth I asserted, to wit, that we prove upon them the most impudent *Forgeries* we accuse them of, and this by an Instance the most weighty, in Dr. *Comber's* Case; because that no one ever pretended more to *Ingenuity*, *Sincerity* and *Charity*, and I boldly assert it, No one was ever guilty of so many and so outrageous and malicious *Forgeries*. But because this *Postscript* swells already much beyond its due Bounds, to convince also Dr. *Sherlock*, that we do not generally forbid the reading of Heretical Books, but only to such as want Abilities or Application, to search into, and find out their gross *Forgeries*, I will publish a Book written by a Lay-Gentleman, to whom I had recommended the Reading of the *Advice to Roman-Catholics*; by which it will appear how modestly I spoke, when I said that Dr. *Comber's* Forgeries and Falsifications could be produced by *Dozens*; for the Reader will find them exposed by *Scores*, and such as will allow of no Colour, but the Blushes of the hardest Forehead.

*Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam.*

*A Third Letter of F. Lewis Sabran of  
the Society of J E S U S, to Mr. Needham,  
Licenſer of the Second Part of Dr. Sherlock's  
Prefervative againſt Popery; Giving an ac-  
count of the Miſrepresentations and Calum-  
nies that make up the whole Book.*

S I R,

**W**HILST my Second Letter to you is yet under the Preſs, I meet with a Second Part to the *Prefervative* Licenſed by you to come abroad; and becauſe I apprehend, by a charitable Judgment, that you approve not all that you Licenſe, but (which of the two may be the leſſer Fault) refer your ſelf to the Author's Ingenuity and Accurate-  
neſs, I venture once more to give you an account of the ſcan-  
dalous *Untruths*, and unconfcionable *Forgeries*, in plain Mat-  
ters of Fact, unto which you have unwarily put your Hand.

If *Reaſon* was much abuſed by the *Fiſt* Part of the *Prefervative*, *Religion* is ſlandered at a far higher rate by the *Second*; in which the *Catholic Faith* appears ſo diſfigured, that had I not conſulted the Title, I had never diſcovered againſt what Church Dr. *Sherlock* directs his outrageous *Investives*. I laid open the *Errors* of the *Fiſt* in a ſingle Sheet; a full Answer to the thredbare and weak *Objections* he hath made a Col-  
lection of in the *Second*, would not take up half a Sheet, if yet they could challenge at all to be conſidered: but he hath packt them up in ſo many ſlie and equally falſe *Inſinuations* (which claim for him κατ' ἐξοχήν, the Title of *The Miſreprefenter*) and backt them with ſuch a train of moſt ſhameleſs *Calumnies*, that the bare expoſing of them (which is their plain *Confutation*) will I fear take up two or three Sheets. I will follow the  
order

order of his four *Sections*, and first summing up in each his Misrepresentations and Calumnies, I will give them no other Answer than by a fair and full account of our Faith; the ugly Mask he hath disfigured her by, will be no prejudice to her, when her Face appears.

*Ten Misrepresentations and Calumnies contrived by  
Dr. Sherlock, in his First Paragraph  
Concerning Idolatry.*

1. **S**acrifice is the only Act of Worship which the Church of *Preserv. fol. 3.*  
*Rome* appropriates to the Supreme God; she doth not pay to him alone that degree of Worship which the tempting Devil demanded of Christ, whereas our Saviour denying to give him this inferior degree of Worship, thereby teaches that no degree of Worship must be given to any Being but the Supreme God.
2. The *Papists* by their worshipping Saints, Angels, and the Virgin *Mary*, put them in the Throne of God.
3. They offer not their Prayers only in the Name of Christ, *Fol. 4.*  
that in him they may find acceptance.
4. They make not their Applications to *One* God by *One* Mediator.
5. They *Fol. 9.*  
bow to or towards their Images as the Objects of their Worship, and in that are Idolaters: So were not the *Jews* on account of the *Cherubins* which by God's Ordinance covered the *Mercy-seat*; for tho' the People, in pursuance of *David's* Advice, did bow down to, and worship God's Footstool, and tho' this relate to the Ark, yet how doth *David's* Exhortation to worship the *Ark*, which is God's Footstool, prove that all their Worship must be directed to the *Cherubins*, which are his Throne? Suppose the *Jews* were to direct their Worship towards the *Mercy-seat*, which was covered with the *Cherubins*, where God had promised to be present, how are the *Cherubins* concerned in this Worship, which was paid only to God as peculiarly present at that Place? which is no more than to lift up our Hands and Eyes to Heaven where the Throne of God is, when we pray to him, but the very Image (for Example, of Christ crucified) is the Object of the Worship of *Papists*.
6. By the *Incarnation* God is visibly represented to us in our *Nature*; *Fol. 12.*

Sol. 13.

Nature; but the *Papists*, not contented with this, contrary to the Design of God made Man, make and adore other Images of God. 7. They have the Worship of Creatures and Images still; and therefore all the visible Idolatry that ever was practised in the World before. 8. They only change the Heathens Country-Gods into Saints and Angels, and give new Names to their Statues and Images. As to internal Notions, 9. The *Pagan* Philosophers made the same Apologies for their Worship of Angels, and Dæmons, and Images, which the Learned *Papists* now make. And 10. 'Tis doubtful whether the Unlearned *Papists* have not as gross Notions about their Worship of Saints and Images, as the Unlearned *Heathens* had.

*The Faith and Practice of Catholics as to  
their Worship.*

Qui confidunt  
in eis. *Pf.* 133.  
Sacrificans diis  
Eradicabitur  
præterquam  
Domino Deo  
soli. *Exod.* 22.

THE *Catholic*, hating above all Sins the vain and abominable Idolatry of the *Heathens*, says *Amen* to that heavy Curse of *David* on all those who put their trust in those strange and false Gods; for those truly make a false God, not who carve his Idel, but who create him a Divinity in their Mind and Heart, by having recourse to him by Prayers and Sacrifices, and what Sacrifice more valuable than that of the Heart, by a full return of confidence and dependence? He acknowledges no other Name to be invoked, no other Protection to be sought,

but of our Lord God thro' Christ in the Holy Ghost; That there is no other Name under the Heavens, in which we can attain Salvation; 'Tis God's Mercy, and his only he calls upon, from him only with the Prophet he seeks his Eternal Bliss: So that he adheres to God alone, (*Psal.* 84.) and places

Non est in alio aliquo salus, non enim est aliud nomen sub cælo datum hominibus in quo oporteat nos salvos fieri. *Act.* 4.

Ostende nobis Domine misericordiam tuam & salutare tuum da nobis. *Pf.* 84.

therein his Virtue and Comfort; That all his Prayers lift up his Heart towards God, fix his Hope on God, increase his Love of God: From him alone he seeks Relief in Want, Protection in Adversity, Grace in Temptations, Security in Dangers, Virtue during Life, Victory in Death, Happiness in Eternity.

nity. As he abhors that Saying of the Poet, *Each Mans Security is best placed in himself*; so with St. *Augustin*, he equally fears that Curse of the Prophet, *Be he accursed who confides in Man*. He owns with *Ezekiel*, that the Protection of *Noe*, *Daniel*, or *Jacob*, will not avail their wicked Children; and he places amongst them all those who put their trust not in their Creator but Creatures, not on God but their Fellow-Servants. He believes that each best Gift, each perfect Good, is from above, and issues from the Father of Lights; That whoever sweats under temporal Afflictions, and thirsts after ease and comfort; who ever sighs under spiritual Infirmities, and faints for want of relief; whatever our craving Hearts pant for, *Jesus* is ready by his Blessings to refresh us; and that since he shed his precious Blood for us on the Cross, 'tis our fault in not addressing our selves to him with confidence, if *Isay's* Promise be not fulfilled in us, *You shall with joy draw abundant Waters* (of all Comforts) *from the Fountains of your Saviour* (his Wounds:) And therefore in all his Prayers he casts ever his Eyes on *Jesus* the Author of his Faith, and the Perfector of it; it being the Essence of his Religion, that it fix his Thoughts, Hopes, Wishes, Prayers, and whole Soul on God. This all our Pulpits ever Preach, all our Universities and Divines teach, all our Catechisms explain, all our Books of Devotion move us to, all our Liturgies, public and private Prayers express. If we honor God's faithful Servants now glorious in his Presence, if we ask of them to joyn their Prayers to ours, 'tis God's Glory we aim at, and God's Mercy we sue for.

All Divine Worship we pay to God alone, an inferior Worship we not only may, but must pay wherever it is due, as *S. Paul* commands us. The reason of it is, that all Worth and Dignity exacts a proportionable Value and Esteem, and having it interiorly, we ought to express it exteriorly, and such Expressions we call *Worship*, and those who may challenge it, *Worshipful*. If that Excellency and Worth be created and natural, as *Power*, *Greatness*, *Learning*, we call it Civil Worship; such is paid to Kings, Magistrates, Parents. If Divine and uncreated, we call it Divine Worship, or *Latria*, and pay it to God alone. If created, but supernatural, 'tis a *Religious* Worship;

*Aug. de Prædest. SS. cap. 1.*

*Ezech. cap. 14.*

*Jacobi 1.*

*Joan. 7.*

*Isaia 12.*

*Quod uni Deo religemus animas nostras. Aug. de vera relig. cap. 55.*

*Cui honorem, Rom. 13.*

*Ἡ τῶν ὁμολογῶν λαοῦ τιμὴ. Hom. 26. de S. Mīm. M.*

Worship, but such as is paid to holy Fellow-Creatures, as St. Basil observes : Such is paid to holy Places, as Churches; to holy Things, as the Sacraments ; to holy Persons, as Prophets, Prelates, Princes, living Saints, and with more reason, to those who in Glory possess God ; therefore, as St. Augustin observes, *We give them that Worship of Charity and Fellowship which we pay to Saints on Earth, but with as much greater a Devotion, as we are more certain of their Holiness, now they are past all Dangers and Uncertainties, but with that Worship which in Greek is called Latria, which is a Servitude properly owed to the Divinity ; we neither worship, nor teach to worship any one but God.* 'Tis false that Sacrifice is the Only Act of Worship which we appropriate to God ; we appropriate to him all positive Prayer or Worship, and give none but Relative, or directed finally to God, to any Saint or Angel. It was a Calumny invented by Faustus the Manichean, that we had exchanged the Pagan Idols for others, to wit, the Shrines of Saints. And St. Augustin having owned Religious Solemnities in honor of Saints, praises them, because the Christians then, (as Catholics now) by them only sought to excite themselves to the Imitation of Saints, to be associated to their Merits, and to be helped by their Prayers, minding that Heretic, that Sacrifice is indeed the only Exterior Worship inseparable from Latria, and therefore never to be offered to any but God ; and therefore then (as now it is still practised) no formal Invocation directed to any Saint, was used at Holy Mass, but only Commemorations, that they might Pray the more for us, the Christians (as St. Gregory Nyssen observes) calling on the Martyr as on God's Minister, who being Invoked by Men, is able to Impetrate for them what Favors he pleases. That Christ by refusing himself all Worship to God's Enemy the Devil, teaches Us to pay none at all to God's Saints and Angels, is an Inference that no one but Dr. Sherlock was ever capable to make. That to bring or invite Saints to the Feet of God's Throne, to joyn their Prayers to ours, is to set them in the Throne of God, is a Position that seems to be supported in spite of all Sense and Reason. The Catholics by Petitioning the Saints to Pray to God for them, do most perfectly worship God, and that by as immediate a Prayer as the Three Children in the Furnace of Babylon,

Pro cultu dilectionis & societatis, &c. Lib. 8. de Civit. c. 26.

Lib. 20. c. 21. contra Faustum.

Tracl. 8. in Joa. Serm. 27. de verb. Dom. L. 22. c. 10. de Civ. In S. Theod. Mar.

Dan. 3.



*Babylon*, as *David* in his 148. Psalm and others, where he invites all Creatures to Praise God; and whatever we admire in them being the Graces and Glory of God, and the Worship which they pay him, as directly leads to God as any other Prayer, the best sort whereof is *Thanksgiving*, or a Memorial of the Blessings we have received our selves from God. Besides, since we are sure that they faithfully return to God as the Author of all that is praise-worthy in them, whatever Praises they receive from us, we honor and worship God more by Praying thus to them, than he that should have held a Book of Prayers to *St. Peter* or *St. Paul* on Earth to read their Seraphical Prayers in.

The Catholic Believes there is but one God, and one Media-  
 tor between God and Men, the Man *Christ Jesus*, as he believes  
 there is one *Lawgiver* and one *Judge*, and one *Redeemer*: yet he  
 believes that he who converts his Brother, saves his Soul, tho'  
 Christ be the only Saviour, because all other Means to Salvati-  
 on have their efficacy from him. Christ is the only Mediator  
 by Nature and his essential Office, by his own Merits only, chal-  
 lenging in Justice to be heard, having given *himself* a full Re-  
 demption: so that he is, as *St. Augustin* observes, *the Priest*,  
*who being now entred into the vail alone there of them who have*  
*been partakers of flesh, doth make intercession for us; yet, as the*  
*same Saint says, without doubt the Martyrs intercede for us.*  
 'Tis true, we are bidden to come with confidence to the throne  
 of glory, that is, with security that a full Ransom is paid for  
 us, of more than sufficient value to obtain whatever we ask;  
 but as the beloved Disciple observes, that full confidence that  
 they shall be heard, is only for those *whose Heart doth not check*  
*them with the consciousness of their Sins, and we reach not the*  
*Pharisaical Pride of those who rank themselves with the Inno-*  
*cents: We own Christ to be the Gate, the Way, he in whose*  
*Name we must ask; and we say with St. Augustin, That*  
*Prayer which is not made in the Name of Christ, Mediator between*  
*God and Man, not only doth not blot out sin, but is it self a sin.*  
 We are certain, that whoever asks as he should in the Name  
 of Christ, will obtain what he asks; and therefore finding our  
 Prayers so often not to be heard, and knowing that the very  
 Prayer of a Sinner is odious to God whilst his Sins crie louder,



we put that adorable Name in the Mouth of Saints, not by choosing them for our *Mediators*, since their Prayers are of no other efficacy or value, but thro' the Passion of Christ; but for our Fellow-Intercessors, as the Apostles themselves, when on Earth, asked the Prayers of others, tho' absent, by their Letters, and we as much apply the Mediation of Christ to us by the Prayers of our Fellow-Members of his Mystical Body, as we do by Alms-deeds and other pious Works; which is no more a derogation to Christ, than that St. *Peter* should work even greater Miracles than he himself, because he wrought them in his Name; and we honor God as much as those who laid their sick Friends where St. *Peter's* Shadow as he pass'd might cover them, in lieu of calling immediately upon Christ, whose Devotion was approved by Miracles.

We pay no other Worship to Images than the *Jews* by the Holy Ghost's Commands paid to the *Ark* or *Mercy-seat*, or to the *Cherubins*: for whatever Dr. *Sherlock* says to the contrary, the same Worship may be paid to God's *Throne* as to his *Foot-stool*; the Images are not the Object of our Worship, but a Means to convey it to its proper Object, which they represent. We adore God *every where*, and particularly where his Representative (as a Crucifix is of Christ) by a livelier Representation renders him more present to our Faith, and we direct no other way our Worship towards a Crucifix, than we do towards Heaven, when we adore God there. We adore but one substantial Image of God, *Christ Jesus*, but Pictures and Material Representations no more than our own Thoughts, when in Contemplation we adore God, tho' we have a singular Veneration for them, (as we have for the Bible) proportion'd to that Civil Respect which we pay to the Images or Statues of our Kings. If our worship of Creatures be Idolatry, all the first Christians were great Idolaters, who shewed so much Respect and Love to St. *Paul* and the other Apostles, and confided so much on their Prayers, which they asked with Tears: for we own and practise no other sort of Creature-worship. That Catholics have every where, and even in this last Age, destroyed all Idols, and converted Nations from Idolatry, is a certain Truth; and therefore 'tis as evident a Calumny, that they have only changed the Names of Idols. The Hea-

then

then Philosophers never pretended that their Prayers to Idols were only to ask the *Prayers* of Angels and Dæmons, not the least footstep of this appears in any one of them : and the Silver-Smith *Demetrius*, who accused *St. Paul* for teaching, that those were not Gods which were the work of mens hands, sufficiently teaches us what Notion was generally received of Idols. I have seen some part of the Catholic World, as *France*, the *Low-Countries*, some Parts of *Italy* and *Germany*; it hath been my great Employ to instruct the weakest Age, and dullest People; yet I profess I never met with any one that was in the least danger to take a Picture or Statue for a God, or for a Saint that heard him : And the Inquisitions, (against whose Severity *Protestants* so often declaim) tho' they have often detected those who turned Jews, (a Persuasion most opposite to Image-Worship) yet never discovered any one, who by the use of Image or Statue, was fallen into Idolatry. We know God can hear us immediately, (and we commonly address our Prayers immediately to him) so he can guard us without the help of Angels, and sanctifie us immediately without the use of Sacraments; but he hath often declared, that he will have his Servants honored; and by *Ezekiel*, that he had sought amongst Men some one that would interpose betwixt his Anger and Sinners, and disarm his Justice; and we look on the blessed Angels, Apostles, Martyrs, and other Saints, as those whose Prayers God sets betwixt us and his Justice, that his Mercy moved by the efficacious Blood of our *One Mediator*, may protect and bleſs us. This account doth, I conceive, sufficiently discover the injurious Misrepresentations and Calumnies which *Dr. Sherlock* hath fastned upon our Worship, under the odious Notion of Idolatry.

Act. 19. 26.

Quoniam non  
sunt dii qui manibus  
fiunt.

Cap. 14.

*Six Misrepresentations and Calumnies contrived by  
Dr. Sherlock, in his Second Section, concern-  
ing the Love and Mercy of God, and Pardon of  
Penitent Sinners.*

1. **T**HE Church of *Rome* teaches, that Christ hath Re-  
deemed us from Eternal, tho' not from Temporal Punish-  
ment.

Phil. 20.

Nl. 18, 19.

Punishments. 2. That Men suffer in *Purgatory* when the Guilt of Sin is before taken away, and the Sinner is in a perfect State of Grace, and needs no Amendment; that is, for no Reason that make it either Good or Just for them to suffer.

Fol. 27.

3. That the Blood of Christ could not expiate for the Temporal Punishment of Sin, which the Merits of some Supere-rograting Saints, or the Pope's Indulgences, or the Priests Masses, can redeem us from: How then could that Blood make Expiation for Eternal Punishment? If his Interest in the Court of Heaven cannot do the less, how can it do the great?

Nl. 28, 29.

4. Again, the Church of *Rome* pretends, that Saints in Heaven Pray for us by way of *Interest* and *Merit*, not of *humble Supplication*. God indeed commanded us to Pray for one another, because 'tis a mutual Exercise of Love and Charity, of Forgiveness of our Enemies, and of other Vertues; but this only becomes those who live and converse together in this World.

Nl. 30.

5. That Church takes the Virgin *Mary*, Angels and Saints, for Mediators, to incline God to be good to peculiar Persons; whereas the Mediation of Christ was not to make God good and kind, (who before was infinitely good) but to reconcile God's Goodness with his Wisdom and Justice, and to make it Wise and Just in God to do good to Sinners. 6. They believe Christ is not Merciful or Pitiful enough; That his Virgin Mother hath tenderer and softer Passions, and such Interest with, or Power over him in the Right of a Mother, that she can have any thing of him; And likewise they suppose other Saints to be much more Pitiful than he.

Fol. 31.

*Dr. Sherlock's Arguments against Purgatory,  
and our recourse to Saints for their Prayers.*

Fol. 16.

Y O U may call the Doctrine of Purgatory *Justice*, you may call it *Vengeance*, but Love it is not. *I should rather chuse to fall into nothing when I die, than to endure a thousand years Torments to be happy for ever.* 'Tis an extravagant Notion, That God may forgive Sins, and yet punish us for them.

Fol. 17.

What is it Men desire, when they desire Pardon? Is it not that

that they may not be punished? 'Tis *something* that God exchange the Eternal Punishment due to Sin in Hell, for the Temporal of Purgatory; but would it not be a perfecter Expression of Love and Goodness, to have remitted the Temporal Punishment also? The Texts that say that Christ died *for our sins*, hath made atonement *for sin*, is a propitiation *thro' faith in his blood*, if they do not signify that a penitent Sinner shall be delivered from (all) the Punishment due to his Sins, how shall he be sure, tho' his Sins are Pardoned, and he Justified, that he shall not be Damned for ever? Redemption from the Curse of the Law cannot signify that we shall not be *Eternally* punished, unless it signify that we shall not be punished (at all,) and therefore not in Purgatory neither. There is no Threatening against Sin in all the Gospel, but Eternal Death; all other Punishments are inflicted by virtue of this Law, consequently he who is delivered from this Curse of the Law, Eternal Punishment, is delivered from the whole Punishment due to Sin. 2 Cor. 4. 18. *The things which are seen* (that is of this World) *are temporal, but the things which are not seen* (that is of the next World) *are eternal*: This is a Demonstration that there is no Purgatory. *Who believes in Christ, shall never die.* 11. Joa. 25. therefore good Men must not go to Purgatory, which is as much perishing and dying as Hell, but not so long; otherwise Purgatory may be Everlasting Life for all I know, and so the Pains of it Eternal. Could I believe our Saviour could leave his Members in Purgatory Fire, which burns as hot as Hell, I should have mean thoughts of his Kindness, and not much rely on him for any thing; when a merciful Man cannot see a Beast in torment without relieving it.

To imagine that we want any Mediator to God; but only our High-Priest, who Mediates in virtue of his Sacrifice, is a reproach to the Divine Goodness. God will never be persuaded by any Intercession to shew Mercy to unfit Objects, that is, to Impenitent Sinners. *He that spared not his Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?* It was not for want of Goodness, or that he needed Entreaties, that he gave his Son to be our Mediator.

Behold (not one omitted) all the Arguments which bear up the most outrageous Declamations of this Man against the Church of God.

The

*The Catholic Doctrin about Purgatory and Saints  
Intercession, and its evident Grounds opposed to  
Dr. Sherlock's Sophistical Cavils.*

WE call the Doctrin of Purgatory, *God's Justice tempered with infinite Mercy*: And tho'tis in our power, by the Mercy of God, to attain Salvation without suffering in Purgatory; yet we judge the Possession of God so infinite a Good, that we believe that Man unworthy ever to see the Face of God, who declares with Dr. *Sherlock*, that did God offer him the Eternal possession of himself on this Condition, that he should first suffer a thousand years, he would absolutely refuse it. We own two sorts of Guilt in Sin; First, an Aversion from God, and slighting of that infinite Good; Next, an Irregular Affection to some transient Good or Pleasure, which the Prophet expresses by the forsaking the Fountain of living Waters, and seeking the leaking Cisterns. To the First is due, an Eternal loss of God's Grace and Glory; to the Second, the Punishment of a sensible Pain. We believe, that thro' Christ we obtain full remission of both Evils at once, whenever we are duly disposed to receive it; to wit, when a perfect Contrition creates in us a full Conversion to God, and an equal detestation of all sensible Pleasure, that may in the least draw us from God. But when this Disposition is but in a remiss degree in us, God is yet so merciful, as thro' Christ to remit that first Guilt; and the Blood of Christ being particularly applied by the Sacrament of Penance, by the infusion of his sanctifying Grace, to make us his *Friends*, altho', because we endeavor but weakly to be entirely such, a sensible Pain remains due to us, to punish the past sinful Pleasure not sufficiently mortified, either to be suffered by Penitential Works in this Life, or hereafter in Purgatory. A Man dying in the State of Grace indeed, but without a perfect Contrition, without supplying and increasing it by the due Fruits of Penance, may be called still, (and is so termed by St. *Hierom*) a Sinner, because he carries with him to God's Tribunal, an Obligation of suffering for his Sins, which he hath refused, or hath not had

had time to comply with by a Penitential Life. In this Method of God's Judgments there appears but an unbiassed Justice, yet accompanied with a singular Mercy, by which God restores his Favor to us, before our Hearts be as perfectly converted as his Justice might well require. So God was merciful to the Israelites, when at Moses's Prayer he forgave them their past Sin of Idolatry, tho' as St. Hierom observes, he protested in his Justice, that he would punish that Sin in the day of revenge. Thus he was merciful to David, when Nathan acquainted him that *Our Lord had put away his Sin*, yet Just in punishing it by the death of his Child. Thus from the beginning he had been merciful to Adam, whom he brought forth of his Sin, yet how severely he punished him in his Justice, we know and feel in our selves yet the smart of it. 'Twas in contemplation of this Truth St. Augustin thus addressed himself to God; *Thou hast loved Truth, that is, thou hast not left unpunished the Sins of those thou hast pardoned, so extending Mercy, as not to swerve from Truth and Equity.* For as St. Basil teaches us, altho' God hath in his only begotten Son granted to all, as much as in him lies, Remission of Sin, yet because Mercy and Judgment are joyned together, it is necessary that those things which are spoken of Penance by the Prophets and Apostles, be performed in us; that the Judgments of the Divine Justice may be seen. We own that the Blood of Christ cleanses us from all Sins, but applied according to the Methods of a Just and Merciful Providence. Thus it cleanses from all Guilt of, and releases all Punishment due to Sin, by the Waters of Baptism; and following Sins by the Tears of Penance, or if those flow more sparingly than God requires, by the Fire of Purgatory. Again, there are several Sins which unpardoned in this World, are pardoned, but after due Punishment, in the other. They make God severe indeed, and wonderfully blast his Mercy, who interpret that Sentence of God by *Ezekiel, The Soul which sinneth shall die*, and that by St. Paul, *The wages of sin is death*, of any the least Offences, admitting of none venial in their nature, and say, *That without Faith and Repentance even the least and lightest Sins are damnable and deadly.* We own that several lighter Sins bereave not a Soul of Grace and Justice, since that (Prov. 24.) *Seven times the just man falls and rises again*; and as St. John witnesses

Exod. 32.  
Hier. Ep. 12.  
ad Gaud.

2 Reg. 12.

Sap. 10.

Aug. in Ps. 50.  
Basil. reg. brev.  
inter. 12.

Ezekiel. cap. 18.

Ad Rom. 6.

Falk in 1 Ep.  
Joan.



Joan. 1.

Jacob. 3.

witnesses of the most perfect, *If we shall say we have no sin, we seduce our selves, and the truth is not in us.* In many things we offend all, says another Apostle, who teaches us, that besides Concupiscence which is no sin, there is a conception of it which bringeth forth sin; yet that sin only which is consummated, engenders death. They are then most injurious to God's Mercy, who own not that there is a degree of Knowledge and Consent so imperfect, that tho' God is offended by it, yet the Band of Charity is not broken by it, but the fervor only of that Virtue is diminished. These Sins are purged by the Fire of Purgatory, this Guilt is punished there. We hold then Purgatory Fire to be a purging Flame, which punishes Guilt: Of this the Prophet *Isay* tells us, that *Our Lord shall purge the dregs of the daughter of Sion, and shall wash the blood of Hierusalem out of the midst thereof, in the spirit of judgment and in the spirit of combustion.* And *Malachy*, *Our Lord is like a purging fire: He shall even refine the sons of Levi, and purifie them as gold and silver.*

Isay 4.

Malach. 3.

Lib. 20. c. 25.  
de Civit.

In Psalm 65.

Which words (says St. *Augustin*) cannot signifie a separation only of the polluted from the pure in the last penal Judgment, but must signifie a purgation of the good, who have need thereof: whence in this firm belief he used the following Prayer: *Purge me in this Life, and make me such an one as shall not need the amending fire.* Is it not a Position most suitable to the Mercy of God, by which we hold, that the Sacrifice of our Blessed Lord's Body and Blood daily offered on our Altars, eases those suffering Souls, and that God accepts of the Prayers of his faithful Servants offered for them; so that as St. *Peter Chrysologus* expresses it, *Souls redeemed* (from the Guilt and Eternal Punishment of Mortal Sins) *by the Grace of Christ, have remission* (of lesser Sins and Temporal Punishment) *obtained by the Intercession of the Church; and what the just Sentence of God would otherwise not have granted, the meritorious Prayers of the Church* (offering the Blood of Christ) *obtain it from God's Mercy, as a gratuit Gift.* Out of these Pains Christ after his holy Passion rescued many, (*Act. 2.*) whom God raised up, loosing the sorrows of Hell. On which words S. *Augustin* grounds the belief of the Church, *That the Soul of Christ did descend into the place where Sinners are punished, to release them of their Torments, whom he in his Justice thought worthy to be released; otherwise* (adds the Holy Doctor)

Ut Christi gratia jam redempti sanctæ Ecclesiæ intercessione solvantur, & quod sententia negat, Ecclesia mereatur, præbet gratia. S. *Pet. Chrysol. Serm.* 325.

I see



I see not how to expound that Text.—For neither Abraham nor *Lib. 12. de Gen. ad litt. cap. 33.*  
the poor Man in his Bosom, that is, in the secret of his quiet rest,  
was restrained in Sorrows. Sins then are truly punished in  
Purgatory, and through the Grace of Christ are there re-  
mitted. Hence Christ could say of the Sin against the Holy  
Ghost, *That it shall not be forgiven in this world, nor in the world* *Matt. 12.*  
*to come*; which could not be truly said, as St. *Augustin* ob-  
serves, *Except there were some, who altho' not in this World, yet* *Ibid. l. 21. c. 24.*  
*in the next might be forgiven.* A Proof so often urged by the  
holy Doctor St. *Bernard*, against the Heretics of his time.  
Purgatory then is that Prison, as *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian*  
observe, into which many are cast, when they are no more in  
the Way, and have been presented to the Judge, till they pay  
the last Farthing, of which Christ speaks. St. *Paul* teaches  
the *Corinthians* this Article of Faith, when beside, that general  
Fire which goeth before the Face of the Lord in that Day  
*which shall be revealed by Fire*, and the Fiery Trial of Judgment  
it self, *where the work of every one, of what kind it is the Fire* *1 Cor. 3.*  
*shall try*, he asserts a third purging Fire, of which he says, *If*  
*any ones work burn, he shall suffer detriment, but himself shall be*  
*saved, yet as through Fire.* A Doctrin most suitable to God's  
Justice and Mercy: for says the often cited St. *Augustin*, *In Psalm 37.*  
*Why are some said to be saved by Fire? Because they build upon the*  
*Foundation (of Faith and Charity) Hay, Wood, Scumbe; but if*  
*they would build Gold, Silver, and Precious Stones, they might be*  
*secure from both Fires; not only from that Everlasting, which shall*  
*punish the Impious Eternally, but from that which shall AMEND*  
*them who shall be saved by Fire.* — *Who altho' they be saved by*  
*Fire, yet that Fire will be more. painful and grievous than any*  
*thing that can be suffered in this Life; not for want of Mercy in*  
*God, but because he punishes Sin whereever he sees it, as he ef-*  
*sentially hates it.* Yet Christ truly obtained remission from  
all Temporal as well as Eternal Pain; whence, whoever is  
regenerated by Baptism, as the same Doctor observes, *he not* *De Civit. Dei*  
*only is not adjudged to Eternal Torments, but neither doth he suffer* *l. 21. c. 26.*  
*after Death any Purgatory Pains, if he die in that State of re-*  
*covered Innocency.* Now I would know, whether God be  
less Merciful, because *Ezekiel* puts this Sentence in his  
Mouth, *Lay her naked upon the Coals until her Brass be heated,* *Ezech. cap. 2.*  
and

to Humil.  
Rom. 16.

Orations ad  
Dom.

Lik. 4. Ep. 2.

Hom. 6. in  
Exod.

Dan. 7. 10.

and all her Tin be fried out ; because that (says the same Doctor) there idle Words, and wicked or impure Cogitations ; there the multitude of lesser Sins, which have infested the Purity of her nobler Nature, shall seeth forth ; there the Tin or Lead, which have obscured the Divine Image, shall be consumed ; all which might here with Alms-deeds and Tears, after a more short and easie way, have been purged from the Soul. Is it not just as St. Gregory Nyssen observes, That all vicious Affections be purged either in this World by a sober course of Life, or after our departure hence by the Furnace of Purgatory Fire ? Is God not Merciful, because (Revel. 21.) Nothing defiled can enter that Kingdom ? Was St. Paul injurious to the Mercy of Christ, when he chastised his Body, to make up what was wanting in himself (not in Christ) of the Passions of Christ ; that is, such Dispositions as Gods Justice requires in us, that his Mercy through Christ may take effect ? Those Sectaries, I am sure, of Dr. Sherlock's Persuasion, who will not own any one Action of the Just to their very last gasp to be freed from Sin, are very injurious to Gods Justice, if those Sins are no where to be punished, with which they grant each Christian to go out of this Life.

But those Punishments may last so long ! That depends of us : let us but possess as perfect a Charity as God offers us, and by his holy Grace enables us to purchase, and we shall all avoid Purgatory. Thus a Martyr's perfect Charity sets him out of the reach of those Flames. As St. Cyprian observes, One thing it is a long time punished for Trespasses to be amended and purged by Fire, and another to abolish all Faults by suffering for Christ. No one suffers in Purgatory because God is not infinitely Merciful, but because he refuses to love that infinite Mercy as much as he ought, and God requires. 'Tis still (through Gods Mercy) in our power during Life, to shorten those Sufferings : For, as Origen warns us, if any one bring a little Iniquity, that little Lead ought to be consumed by Fire ; and if more heavy and leaden Metal, he is more burnt, that more may be wasted. God were not Just if, as Daniel saw him, a fiery and violent Flood did not run before his Face, to consume and punish Sin. 'Tis by reason of our Sins, as St. Augustin observes, that some shall pass through a fiery Lake, and horrible Shallows full of burning Flames, as much as shall remain of the  
Dross

*Drofs of Sin, fo long shall the delay of the Passage be.* This Justice of God it is which made all holy Men ever to fear and tremble at the approaches of Death and Judgment, whilst the very lewdest Livers amongst Sectaries, grounded on the security of a prodigious Presumption, if the Minister but tells them they have made their Peace with God, tho' in their whole Life they have never done that Penance for their Sins, without which the Word of God assures them, *they shall altogether perish*; tho' perhaps they never shed a Tear for their Sins, tho' destitute of the help of the Sacraments, yet affront Gods Justice by a bold unconcerned Confidence, whilst they presume on a Mercy never promised to so undisposed Souls. Different was the Sense of the great Doctor St. Hilary: *Since no one* (says he) *appears spotless before God, how can we meet his Judgment with that hope and confidence, in which that unwearied Fire, and those grievous Punishments are to be undergone, which Expiate a Soul from Sin.*

Cum nemo veniens in conspectum ejus mundus sit, quomodo desiderabile ejus potest esse judicium—in animæ supplicia.

quo subeunda sunt gravis illa expiandæ à peccatis

That there remains then after the Guilt of Sin is forgiven, such an Obligation to undergo Punishment, to pass by all the Greek and Latin Fathers, all those Texts of Scripture make it plain, which deliver unto us the necessity of Penance and its due Fruits. Now whoever goes out of this World, not having satisfied this Obligation, hath such a moral unworthiness, as bars him, till it be complied with, from the sight of God. And those who say, that it were a greater Mercy in God to remit all the Punishment due to Sin, blame Christ for Preaching Penance, and account him on that score less merciful. To say with Dr. Sherlock, *That Men desire nothing when they ask Pardon, but merely not to be Punished*, is to declare, they value not Gods Love and Grace like Children, but merely fear the Lash like Slaves; and all Catholics look on such a Disposition, excluding positively all regard to Gods Grace and Love, as incapable of receiving forgiveness of Sins. Christ hath made Atonement for our Sins, but his Blood is to be applied by Baptism, and in case of Relapse, by perfect Contrition or Penitential Works during Life, or Punishment after Death, before all Pain due to Sin be remitted; thus applied, it frees us from the *whole Curse of the Law*. No Suffering or

Punishment is the Death of the Soul, as Dr. *Sherlock* supposes, but only the privation of Gods Grace, which is her Life, and which is enjoyed through Christ as much in Purgatory as by penitent Saints on Earth in their penitential Sufferings; and the mercy of our Lord appears as much in purging his Members from all Stains of the least sin by the Fire of Purgatory, as here by the toilsom Labors of a penitential Life, such as his dearest Servants were ever purified by. St. *Paul* never taught, that *all things* that are not seen, or of another World, are Eternal, or else God would be Eternally Judging, and so never Rewarding his Servants, or Punishing his Enemies; so that Dr. *Sherlock's* Demonstration hath not so much as the least appearance of a seeming Reason.

*Euchirid. c. 10.*

Having thus represented our Faith, I conclude with S. *Augustin* against Dr. *Sherlock*; *It cannot be denied, but that the Souls of the Dead, are relieved by the Piety and Devotion of their living Friends, as often as the Sacrifice of our Mediator is offered, or Alms-deeds are done in the Church for them; but these things do bring profit only to those, who in their Life-time did merit to receive profit by the like after Death: For there is a certain State of Life neither so good, that it needeth not these Helps after Death, nor so evil, but that it may be helped by the same.*

I have already Answered in the first Section, all those Calumnies which are repeated here concerning the Blessed Saints Intercessions for us. Our Doctrin, directly opposite to the slanderous Misrepresentations here offered, is, 1. We look on the Prayers of Saints as meerly *humble Supplications*; for we hold that Christ only *standeth* our Mediator, challenging he alone in Justice, and by his own Merits, to be heard in favor of us. 2. We conceive Charity to be at least as proper to, and inseparable from the Seraphical Souls of Saints, as from any of Gods Servants on Earth, and as much inclining them to Pray for their Fellow-Members of Christ's Mystical Body, engaged here below in Miseries and Dangers. 3. We never required the Prayers of Saints, to render God good and merciful; but only when joyned with our Prayers, to render these a fitter Object of Gods Mercy, and to reconcile the Effects thereof to his Wisdom and Justice. 4. Whatever pity the Saints may have on us, we look on it, as on a small

*Stilla situla.*

Drop,

Drop, compared to the Ocean of Gods infinite Mercy; of which, that very Pity, and the Intercession of Saints, is a free Gift to us, given with all other Blessings, together *with*, and as an Effect of his greatest Gift, to wit, his Eternal Son, with whom, in whom, and by whom, he hath given us all things. This Faith of ours doth, I conceive, most evidently expose the shameless Calumnies, which Dr. *Sherlock* hath disfigured her by.

*Thirty Misrepresentations and Calumnies offered by  
Dr. Sherlock, in his Third and Fourth Sections,  
and some of his Phanatical Principles.*

NEVER did Man speak more without Book, without Truth, and without any respect to Shame or Conscience; this *Preservative* deserving more the Fate of defamatory Libels, than those two which he prizes and recommends *Fol.* 78. No Narrative of the Minister *Oats* contains more Lies and Calumnies against the Persons of Catholics, than the Minister *Sherlock's Preservative* against their Religion; the latter is infinitely more Impudent, because he accuses with an equally shameless Scurrility, not single Persons, but most Princes, Bishops, Universities, Kingdoms of the Christian World, and all the General Councils to boot. I do own, and will maintain it, That no man ever Lyed in Print with more Confidence, ever was so deafned by Passion to all the Reproaches of Conscience and Honor: And had not a long Custom of saying any thing in the Pulpit, tho' never so monstrously false, that could render Catholic Religion odious, or ridicule it by disfiguring it, dictated to his peevish Distemper this Second Part of his *Preservative*, it would not, I conceive, have been possible, that all the Gall that can drop from a Christians Pen, should in one Pamphlet have heaped so many and so defamatory Calumnies. Take the following Instances.

1. *The Catholics by unwritten Traditions, that make up a part* *Fol.* 73, 74, 75. *of their Rule of Faith, mean such things as may be concealed from the knowledge of the World for 1500 Years, never heard of before in the Church of God, kept very privately and secretly for several Ages,*

*Provincial Letters, Jesuits Morals, burnt by the Hang-man.*

*Ages, and totally unwritten.* By Tradition we mean a Revelation received from God, by the Apostles, conveyed by the continual teaching and preaching of Lawful Pastors, strengthened by the visible practice of Christian Churches; found in the Books of Succeeding Fathers and Historians, though not in Canonical Scripture, which St. Paul recommended to *Timothy* faithfully to be kept as a *depositum*. And commanded the *Thessalonians* to observe, which if it be laid by, says St. Basil, *We shall retain of the Preaching of the Faith, but an empty Name*: and which is delivered to us as Preached by the Apostles by the same means, and with the same security at least, as the Letter of the Gospel is conveyed to us, as written by them.

1 Tim. 6.  
2 Thes. 2.  
de Sp. S.c. 27.  
Ipsam fidei  
prædicationem  
ad nudum  
nomen Contra-  
hemus.

Fol. 79.

2. *They teach several External Observances, to be much more pleasing to God, and therefore much better in themselves, than true Gospel Obedience, Moral or Evangelical virtues: that they supply the want of true virtue, Compensate for sin, and make men great Saints.* We teach that Gods inherent Grace only Sanctifies us, and that whatever External observance void of Evangelical virtue, is a sinful Hypocrisie, and only can make one a greater sinner.

Fol. 81, 82.

3. *They teach that when a Priest Absolves men, that forsake not their sins, God must confirm the Sentence of his Minister, and therefore they are Absolved and need not fear; whence they believe that God can be reconciled to sinners, whilst they remain in their sins. And therefore they must believe that God hath given power to his Priests to Absolve those whom he could not Absolve himself.* We teach that to receive Absolution without a real forsaking of our sins, in lieu of forgiveness of them, adds a hainous Sacrilege.

Fol. 90.

4. *In the Church of Rome men may Expiate their sins by Penances, but are under no necessity of forsaking them.* No pain due to sin can be remitted whilst the guilt remains, nor this removed till they be forsaken: no Exterior Penance can in the least Expiate the guilt of sin. This is our Doctrine by which the Calumnies of the following Misrepresentations appear.

5. *They*



3. They account Satisfactory works, Fastings, acts of Penance, *Fol. 45. 46.*  
*Prayers, Alms, though done without the least sorrow for sin,*  
*without any true Devotion to God, without mortifying any one*  
*Lust: mere External Rites and Observances, being judged Satis-*  
*factions and Expiations for Sin.*

6. They use External Mortifications to satisfy for sins, not to *Fol. 91.*  
*kill them by subduing the Flesh to the Spirit; so punish themselves*  
*for sins, that they may commit them more securely again.*

7. The Roman Church teaches, that men need take no care of *Fol. 79.*  
*Venial sins, and that they may keep clear from mortal sin without*  
*any great attainment in virtue.* It teaches a voluntary Venial  
 sin ought not to be committed, to save a whole Worlds Lives:  
 that it disposes to Mortal sins as Diseases do to Death: that  
 if our Passions be not curb'd by the practice of solid Christian  
 Virtues, mortal sins will not be avoided, nor Heaven attained,  
 which they only purchase who use Violence.

8. In the Roman Church Money is paid for Indulgences, *Fol. 45. 48.*  
*and with them Satisfaction and Merits are bought.* To pretend  
 to buy or sell any such Spiritual things, we account a most  
 grievous sin. And every Alms-giver might with as much  
 Justice be accused, to have bought of God, his Grace and Par-  
 don for a sum of Money.

9. They Consecrate senseless things to pardon Venial, or some- *Fol. 44.*  
*times Mortal sin, by touching or kissing them.*

10. They attribute Divine Virtues and Powers to senseless *Fol. 43.*  
*things; as is evident from the honor paid to Relicks: and from the*  
*Consecration of Agnus Dei's, Wax Candles, Oyls, Bells, Crosse,*  
*Ashes, Holy Water.*

11. With them senseless things are capable of the Sanctification *Fol. 44.*  
*of Gods holy Spirit by his Graces, and can convey such Sanctificati-*  
*on by Divine and invisible effluvioms of Grace.* All these are  
 misrepresentations of our Faith which teaches us nothing of  
 all this. What we believe is, that nothing can free us from  
 the guilt of any sin, which is external, and doth not effect  
 and change the heart. That all Creatures of God are good, *1 Tim. 4.*  
 and that they are Sanctified by the word of God and Prayer; nei-  
 ther doth Faith teach us that any Material thing hath any  
 other than Moral Connexion with Grace, either obtain'd for  
 us by the Prayers of the Church, offered for us at the blessing  
 of



of those things, or of those blessed Saints whom we honor, and call upon by that Veneration, or by the Sacraments according to the Institution or Covenant of Christ; but we do not believe that Gods Grace is inherent, but in the Souls of the Faithful, or that any sin is remitted without a due disposition in a repentant sinner. Or any virtue to be now-a-days Communicated otherwise by insensible things, than it was to the Woman that touched the Hem of Christs Garments, or by the Handkerchiefs of St. Paul, or Shadow of St. Peter. Neither do we use any Blessings which we do not find in the Records of the Primitive Church, to have been ordered by the Apostles: as I am ready to make out when ever required.

Fol. 39.

12. *The Popish Ceremonies are more severe and Intollerable than the Jewish Toke it self, which St. Peter tells the Jews, neither they, nor their Fathers were able to bear.* Unless he means it intollerable to Christians to Fast in *Lent*, in imitation of our Blessed Lord, and *Friday* and *Saturday* in memory of his bitter Agony on the Cross, and laying in the Grave for us, or their obligation of praying to God daily, and particularly the Lords day, and of relieving the necessities of the Poor: thus calling Fasting, Watching, Praying, and Alms-deeds so recommended by Christ our Lord, *Mere Ceremonies*: I know no Obligations imposed on the generality of Christians by any positive Law of the Church, which can be called a Yoke. As for the Ceremonies used in the Liturgy, if they be a burden, sure the Clergy or Religious, must feel the weight of them, yet I am sure not one ever owned it, but this predominant passion of Calumniating will venture blindly at the most shameless untruths.

Fol. 40, 41.

13. *Their Canonical Fast is not to abstain from Food, but only from such Meats as are forbidden.* This is most false, but one Meal being allowed of on Fasting-days.

Fol. 41.

14. *There is no imaginable reason why it should be an act of Religion merely not to abstain from Flesh, if Flesh have no legal uncleanness.* Here he would insinuate that we Judaize. But when God by *Hyeremy* praised the *Rhechabites* for abstaining from Wine, was it because Wine was held by them to have a legal uncleanness? Is the taming of the Flesh, the curbing of Sensuality, no reason at all for Abstinence?

15. *They*

15. *They may Fast and say over their Beads and perform their Penances and Satisfaction by another as well as if they did it by themselves.* This is an Impudent Sham. Each man is bound to satisfy by himself, fulfilling the Penances imposed upon him.

16. *They hold that they have no title to Reward by doing their Duty, and therefore they add Works of Supererogation.* A shameless untruth! Nay, the more pressing the Duty is, the greater the Reward; Alms given to a man starving for hunger, we hold more meritorious, than if not so great a necessity bore off the obligation of relieving him. Each necessary observance of the Commandments hath a Crown laid up, to be render'd by the just Judge.

17. *Whilst they Pray in an unknown Tongue, a Parrot may as much be taught to Pray in Spirit as they.* He would insinuate that Catholics when they assist to Prayers which they do not understand, are not Commanded to pray in Spirit by devout thoughts and pious affections, which is a mere Calumny.

18. *They take no care to instruct men in all necessary Doctrins; they learn their Creed as School-boys their Grammar, without understanding it: they receive the Impression that is made on them as Wax doth, and understand no more of the Matter. And wish them this is the utmost perfection of Knowledge that any Christian must aim at.* A heavy Charge, but so perfect a Slander, that besides the Obligation laid on all those that have the charge and Cure of Souls; hundreds of thousands of Religious men, make it their daily Employ to instruct the Ignorant, and each Parish hath Schools of Christian Doctrin to that end: so that usually Children of ten years old can give a better account of their Faith in Catholic Countries, than Sectaries of forty years old can generally do, who have seldom heard of any thing in the Concerns of Religion, but Slanders and Misrepresentations of Catholic Doctrin. It hath been my Lot to deal for some time with a Body of near two hundred Protestants on the score of Religion, and I in truth Protest, that I found not one in six that could give me any reasonable account of Christ being God and Man, and dying for our Redemption. We exact of each Christian that to the best of

his abilities he improve his knowledge in the duties of Faith.

Fol. 76.

19. *They teach a man need not know any thing but the Apostles Creed: therefore Heretics know and believe all things necessary to Salvation, as long as they believe the Apostles Creed. Did Christ teach any thing but what he would have known? We teach that each Christian is bound to know all that he is bound to do, and to understand all those necessary means left by Christ for his Reconciliation and Perfection, though not expressed in the Creed: we teach that each Man is not bound to know all that Christ hath taught, but yet all that Christ has taught as necessary to him in his Station. But this Calumniator confounds what is to be known necessitate Medii; so that he who through no fault of his hath not learn'd it, is however incapable of Salvation: (which is all contained in the Creed) with what must be known, Necessitate Præcepti; because God hath commanded all those who are in the occasion, and in a capacity of being instructed in it, to learn it.*

Fol. 82, 83.

20. *The Church of Rome teaches, that the sins of those sinners who do not repent of them, nor amend their lives, and consequently are not Expiated by the Death of Christ upon the Cross, are Expiated by the Sacrifice of the Mass.*

Fol. 83.

21. *That by the bare opus operatum, by the offering this Sacrifice of the Mass it self, without any good motion in the Person for whom 'tis offered, his sins are Expiated.*

Fol. 85.

22. *That when Christ was Sacrificed upon the Cross, he Expiated only for the Eternal Punishment due to sin; and when Sacrificed in the Mass, only for the Temporal. Behold three loud Calumnies! We teach that Christ on the Cross gave himself a full Redemption for all the Guilt and Debt of Sinners, who apply to themselves that precious Blood, by the means appointed by Christ. That by the Sacrifice of the Mass, as also by any good Christians Prayers for obdurate sinners, such Graces may be obtained, as shall work in them their Salvation: but that no sin is remitted to an impenitent sinner. And all we mean by opus operatum, hath no reference to him who receives the Sacraments, to the whole effect whereof a stubborn and unconverted sinner puts ever a full stop: but in reference to those who Administer the Sacraments, from whose*

Piety

Piety they take not their force; Baptism given by a Priest in the state of sin, having as much its whole effect as given by a Saint, because it takes its value and force from Christ the chiefest Minister in the conferring of it: so the Church did teach by St. *Augustin* heretofore, against *Parmenian* the Heretic, so She teaches to this day.

23. Catholics think that the Intercession of the Virgin Mary, *fol. 87.* or the most Powerful Saints can prevail with our Saviour to do that which according to the Laws of his own Mediation, they know he cannot, and will not do; How can any man be so stupid as to think this? Yet so it is. A bare-face Calumny. For we teach that the blessed Saints, only join their Prayers to ours, to obtain of Christ for us, what he in his mercy will have them to ask: it being a most proper effect of Christ's Mediation, to challenge Blessings for several Members of his Mystical Body on the account of the whole, or moved by the love he bears to the holier Members thereof; since he hath declared that many joining together to Petition in his Name, will obtain Blessings, which had not been granted to the single Prayers of some one.

24, 25, 26. By the Doctrine of Purgatory, they mightily abate *fol. 87, 88.* the terror of Hell, considering how many easy ways there are for rich Men to get out of Purgatory, who have Money enough to buy Indulgences while they live: or Masses for their Souls. Here are three Calumnies that lie thick together. The first, that Catholics exempt sinners from Hell, who in the Protestant Doctrine would be Condemned to it. No unrepented Mortal sin is lodged in Purgatory, or escapes Hell. Secondly, That Indulgences may be bought for Money, or avail a Soul undisposed to receive the benefit of them, through want of Contrition, the guilt of sin not being before remitted. The Third, that Masses said for any Soul in Purgatory, avail such as during life have not deserved and merited that mercy; which untruth I have before defeated, with the words of St. *Augustin*, delivering our Faith in the 110. Chapter of his *Enchiridion* to *Laurence*.

27, 28, 29. The Sacrament of the Lords Supper, besides the *fol. 91.* supernatural conveyance of Grace, is a great Moral instrument to Holiness, representing to us the love of our Crucified Lord, the

merit and desert of sin, requiring the Exercises of a great many virtues, &c. But in the Church of Rome this Sacrament is turned into a dumb Shew, which no body can be edified with, or into a Sacrifice which Expiates sins, and serves us instead of a holy life. Behold three crying Calumnies ! The First, that amongst us there is no other use of the Sacrament of our Lords Supper but for a Shew, or a Sacrifice, whereas that holy Sacrament is received by all pious Catholics at least once a Month; and by an Infinity once or oftner each week, by our Priest daily. The Second, that we require no practice of any Virtue: whereas we interpret the words of St. Paul, *Let a man try himself*, of the Sacrament of Penance, in which we exact a true sorrow for past sins, a firm purpose to dye rather than to fall into any other again: a full satisfaction to all the persons we have injured in their Reputations or Fortunes, or any other way, a perfect entire reconciliation with our Enemies, a removal of all the occasions that lead us into our former sins, or may likely prove a stumbling Block for the future: a breaking and subduing of our Passions by penitential works, Devotion towards the admirable Mystery of our Redemption, humility in accusing our selves of our most secret sins, a firm hope of Remission, &c. But these things are with Dr. Sberlock no Christian Virtues. A Third, that our exposing of the blessed Sacrament is a dumb shew, and that so we assist at Holy Mass; we hold no necessity of a Pious life: whereas we feel that nothing speaks more the Mercies of God; nothing moves us more to Christian Virtues, than this great Sacrament considered with the Eyes of Faith: and believe that this Sacrifice helps much to a holy life, but not at all without it.

30. *Amongst them one can Merit for twenty, so there is no need above one in twenty should be Good.* Merit with us is Personal, and not Communicative; no one is better in the sight of God for the Piety of another: and in what ever sense one may satisfy Gods Justice for the Penitential works he exacts from an other whose sin is remitted, no one hath a title to the least degree of Glory, and consequently hath any Merit by an others Sanctity, or Merit.

Many

Many more of this Man's Calumnies I pass by, these Thirty and the other Ten I have laid down, being a clear Evidence, that he is the most confident Calumniator that ever Preached or Writ; who dares say any thing without the least respect to Truth, without any regard to Charity, Honor or Conscience. Now, Sir, give me leave to offer you some few of the many Fanatical Principles he advances, as destructive to what you call your Church, as to Christianity in general; that in your second thoughts you may blush (if you are capable of it) for having set your Name to them, and Licensed them to the Press.

The First. *God being a Spirit, must not be sought for in Houses. Fol. 48, 50, 51. of Wood and Stone; because he must be worshipped in Spirit, he must not be worshipped by any material or sensible Representations. Those words, Except your Righteousness exceeds the Righteousness of the Fol. 38. Scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, cuts off every thing that is External in Religion. Do not these Principles remit all Christians to the Silent Meetings of Quakers? Exclude the use of Churches rather than Barns; Singing of Psalms, and such other material Representations of the God whom we Praise?*

The Second. *God and Christ are not present in the Assemblies Fol. 37. of Christians by any Figurative or Symbolical Presence: There is no Symbolical Presence of God under the Gospel. 'Tis a great Fol. 34, 55. Absurdity to talk of more Symbolical Presences of God than one: for a Symbolical Presence confines the unlimited Presence of God to a certain Place in order to certain Ends; as for Example, to receive the Worship which is paid him. Now to have more than one such Presence as these, is like having more Gods than one. To say nothing of the absurdity of this Discourse, which makes that Christian an adorer of two Gods, who by Faith adoring God in Heaven and in his own Soul, worships him in both places; doth not this destroy the very Essence of your Sacrament, the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, which you own to be a Symbolical Presence of Christ?*

The Third. *If God be better worshipped before an Image than Fol. 53, 54 without one, then the Worship of God is more confined to that Place where the Image is. I cannot see how to avoid this; whereas there is no appropriate Place of Worship under the Gospel. And 'tis the same*



*same, tho' the Image be not appropriated to any Place, but carried about with us; for still the Image makes the Place of Worship. This is an Argument for all Dissenters from you, and all Fanatics against a Set Liturgy, a Set Form of Prayer: for if God be better worshipped by a Set Form of Prayer than without it, then the Worship of God is more confined to that Place where that Set Form of Prayer, that Set Liturgy is used; and 'tis the same, tho' no set Place be appointed for that Set Form of Prayer, &c. The Parallel is exact.*

Fol: 34, 36.

*The Fourth: Having laid this Principle, All that is merely External in Religion, is taken away, all Rites believed to be in themselves Acts of Religion, and to render the Worshipper acceptable to God; and this because God must be worshipped as a meer Spirit. To defend the use of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, he brings this only Reason: Mankind by Sin hath forfeited all natural Right to Gods Favor, they can challenge nothing but by Promise and Covenant, such Covenants require a mutual Stipulation on both Sides; Therefore they must be transacted by some visible and sensible Rites, whereby God obliges himself to us, and we to him. Is not this last Inference destroyed by the former Principle, taking away all Rites that are Acts of Religion, all that is merely External? And on this Principle ought he not to teach, that the mutual Stipulation betwixt God and us, must be made by his interior Graces, and our interior Worship, because God must be worshipped as a meer Spirit? Upon whatever account that interior Covenant requires a visible sensible Mark, and our actual Communion with Christ another, all the Communications of Gods Graces to us, all our return of Worship and Adoration will equally admit of sensible Signs and Rites. To avoid farther Prolixity, I will end with the following Principle of his, most injurious to Christ, and an open and never to be coloured Blasphemy.*

Fol. 68, 69, 70.

*Fifth Principle. There never was, never can be an Infallible Judge; Christ himself was not an Infallible Judge, altho' he were an Infallible Teacher. I must my self judge of his Doctrine, before I know that he is Infallible; therefore Men were to judge of Christ's Doctrine, before they believed him; and they are thus to this day to Examine his Doctrine by the Law and Prophecy, and he never required that they should submit to his Infallible Authority without*



without Examination. He could not be an *Infallible Judge*, obliging Men to receive all his Dictates as Divine Oracles, without Examination: 'Twas impossible to know him to be Infallible, but by judging of his Doctrin, by the agreement thereof with the Principles of Reason, and of former Revelations. Doth a Christian teach this, and a Christian approve and license it! What, *JESUS* our God blessed for evermore, even when owned the Son of God, even from us Christians, cannot exact a Submission to his Infallible Authority, without Examination of the truth of what he says, by comparing it with the Principles of Human Reason! He cannot oblige us to receive all his Dictates as Divine Oracles! Was Christian Faith, was the Author of it *JESUS*, ever thus affronted! Did the Apostles err, did they act against Sense and Reason, when they believed what he had taught, of his *Flesh being meat* in- Joh. 6. v. 69. deed, only because he had the words of *Eternal Life*, because his Dictates were Divine Oracles? Were all men of this mind, Christ would not indeed find any Faith on Earth. What tho' we certainly know Christ to have taught and declared a Truth, must we not upon his word submit to it and embrace it, till we have consulted our Reason, and found it can object nothing against it? Were the weapons of *S. Paul's* 2 Cor. 10. 5. warfare such as could humble what raised it self against the science of God, and bring into captivity all understanding in obedience to Christ, and had the Word and Preaching of Christ less power? Christ teaches it is not yet a sufficient Motive for me to believe? Should an Angel from Heaven teach me this, I would with *St. Paul* return him no other Answer than *Anathema*; and do you, Sir, approve this? Do you License men to teach to Christians, they are not to submit to Christ's Word as to Divine Oracles; that they must make themselves his Judges, and Examined by their Reason, whether he spoke truth or no? Well, Sir, were it but not to give occasion to the spreading so horrid Blasphemies against our Lord and God, I take my leave of you, and of such Books Licensed by you; and end with this Profession of my Catholic Faith: *Christ is an Infallible Judge, I must not Judge of his Doctrin, but believe it, and submit to him; I submit to his Infallible Authority without Examination; I receive all his Dictates as Divine Oracles. If,*

tho'

tho' Summoned by me, you still refuse to Subscribe to the  
 Doctrin, I will obey St. John's Counsel, I will have nothing  
 to do with you nor return to you so much as Ave, or any  
 Greeting; but content my self with Subscribing to this Pro-  
 fession of my Faith,

**LEWIS SABRAN**

Of the Society of

**JESUS.**